

the 1990s, the number of people in the world who are undernourished has increased from 600 million to 800 million. The number of people who are malnourished has increased from 1.2 billion to 1.5 billion. The number of people who are obese has increased from 100 million to 300 million.

The World Bank has estimated that the number of people who are undernourished in the world has increased from 600 million in 1990 to 800 million in 2000. The number of people who are malnourished has increased from 1.2 billion in 1990 to 1.5 billion in 2000. The number of people who are obese has increased from 100 million in 1990 to 300 million in 2000.

The World Bank has estimated that the number of people who are undernourished in the world has increased from 600 million in 1990 to 800 million in 2000. The number of people who are malnourished has increased from 1.2 billion in 1990 to 1.5 billion in 2000. The number of people who are obese has increased from 100 million in 1990 to 300 million in 2000.

The World Bank has estimated that the number of people who are undernourished in the world has increased from 600 million in 1990 to 800 million in 2000. The number of people who are malnourished has increased from 1.2 billion in 1990 to 1.5 billion in 2000. The number of people who are obese has increased from 100 million in 1990 to 300 million in 2000.

The World Bank has estimated that the number of people who are undernourished in the world has increased from 600 million in 1990 to 800 million in 2000. The number of people who are malnourished has increased from 1.2 billion in 1990 to 1.5 billion in 2000. The number of people who are obese has increased from 100 million in 1990 to 300 million in 2000.

The World Bank has estimated that the number of people who are undernourished in the world has increased from 600 million in 1990 to 800 million in 2000. The number of people who are malnourished has increased from 1.2 billion in 1990 to 1.5 billion in 2000. The number of people who are obese has increased from 100 million in 1990 to 300 million in 2000.

The World Bank has estimated that the number of people who are undernourished in the world has increased from 600 million in 1990 to 800 million in 2000. The number of people who are malnourished has increased from 1.2 billion in 1990 to 1.5 billion in 2000. The number of people who are obese has increased from 100 million in 1990 to 300 million in 2000.

The World Bank has estimated that the number of people who are undernourished in the world has increased from 600 million in 1990 to 800 million in 2000. The number of people who are malnourished has increased from 1.2 billion in 1990 to 1.5 billion in 2000. The number of people who are obese has increased from 100 million in 1990 to 300 million in 2000.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

<http://www.archive.org/details/slavmoslem00brodrich>

M. A. Washburn
22 Prospect Street

SLAV AND MOSLEM.

COPYRIGHT BY

J. BRODHEAD,

DEC., 1893.

PRINTED AND BOUND BY
WALKER, EVANS & COGSWELL CO.
CHARLESTON, S. C.
1894.

PRESERVATION
COPY ADDED
ORIGINAL TO BE
RETAINED
MAY 22 1895

SLAV AND MOSLEM.

HISTORICAL SKETCHES

—BY—

J. MILLIKEN NAPIER BRODHEAD.

AIKEN PUBLISHING CO.,

AIKEN, S. C.

DR40
B77

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS.	PAGE
Governments are not improvised—Liberties are taken not given—The present must be read in the light of the past—Slow development is not a sign of inferiority—Conflicting opinions about Russia.....	1

CHAPTER II.

RUSSIA'S ORIGIN AND EARLY CIVILIZATION.	
Peculiarity of Russia's antecedents—Rurick and the Varegs—Expeditions to Constantinople—Introduction of Christianity.....	17

CHAPTER III.

TARTAR DOMINATION.	
Partition—Anarchy—Small Republics—Genghis Khan—The Greek Church—Isolation of Russia.....	27

CHAPTER IV.

THE GRAND DUKES OF MOSCOW.	
Dimitri Donskoi—Overtures from Rome—Ivan the Great and Ivan the Terrible—Autocracy a popular government.	36

CHAPTER V.

SERFDOM.

PAGE.

Origin and peculiarities of Serfdom in Russia— Significance of the Emancipation—Impervious- ness to Nihilism—Peasant colonization.	46
--	----

CHAPTER VI.

RUSSIAN CHARACTERISTICS.

Topographical and climatical influences—Tran- sition State—Democracy in Russia—Political inaptitude—Patriotism	64
--	----

CHAPTER VII.

SLAVOPHILES AND OCCIDENTALS.

Definition—Panslavism—The Mir—The Zemst- vos—Autocracy plus autonomy—Apotheosis of the People.	86
--	----

CHAPTER VIII.

THE ROMANOFFS AND THE REVOLUTIONARY
MOVEMENT.

German bureaucracy—National dualism—The Russian Police—Bakounin and Nihilism— Atchinoff—The ideal side of Nihilism—Failure and evil consequences.	102
--	-----

CHAPTER IX.

RUSSIA IN ASIA.

The ebb and flow of Humanity—The Roman Eagle at the gates of British India—Motives and mode of Russia's advance in Asia—Her policy and achievement.	129
--	-----

CHAPTER X.

THE AFGHAN QUESTION.

PAGE.

Ethnical Side—Pendjeh incident—England's policy—A possible casus belli.....	149
---	-----

CHAPTER XI.

THE OTTOMAN TURKS.

Origin—Fall of Constantinople—Decadence of the Ottoman Empire—Amalgamation and progress impossible.....	158
---	-----

CHAPTER XII.

TURCO-RUSSO WARS.

Russia's reprisals against the Moslems—Defeat of Peter the Great—Victories of Catherine II—Treaty of Kainardji, 1774—Revolt of the Servians—Massacre of 1821.....	170
---	-----

CHAPTER XIII.

THE CRIMEAN WAR.

Greek Independence—Navarino, 1827—Shopkeeper Policy—The Khedive—Treaty of Adrianople, 1829—Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi—Convention of the Straits, 1841—Remote causes of the Crimean War—Napoleon III—Lord Stratford de Redcliffe—Sinope—Treaty of Paris, 1856	178
---	-----

CHAPTER XIV.

THE BULGARIAN WAR. PAGE.

The Situation reviewed by Gladstone—Schuyler's Report—Plewna—San Stefano and the Berlin Conference, 1879.....	210
---	-----

CHAPTER XV.

ALEXANDER THE THIRD.

Consolidation of the Russian Empire—Russianizing of Russia begun by Nicholas First—Finland and the Baltic Provinces—The Jewish Question—Russian Dissenters—G. Kennan and the Fourth International Prison Congress.....	232
--	-----

CHAPTER XVI.

CONCLUSION.

The Triple Alliance—The Eastern Question—The future of Constantinople—Irretrievable decomposition of the Ottoman Empire.....	279
--	-----

CHAPTER I.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS.

When we have reached the term we are apt to lose sight of the starting point, the slow initiation, the tardy progress by which we advanced to the goal. Americans, in particular, are disposed to think that any nation can, at a given moment, draw up a Declaration of Independence, and endow itself with a free Constitution, like our own, forgetting that the first springs of this admirable mechanism were devised in the Councils of the Witenagamot, many hundreds of years ago, and that the battles of Bunker Hill and Lexington began to be fought on the plains of Runymede.

“Nations always have the government they deserve.” In other words they have the form of government which comports with their actual status, whether this status be the result of uncontrollable antecedents, or the expression of inherent and inalienable race qualities good or bad.

Lawlessness arms the tyrant, imbecility and incapacity create despotism. When the leaven of civilization has penetrated the masses and developed humaneness and individualism, the self recognition of personal royalty, tyranny and despotism cease of themselves.

The social body has outgrown the fungus to which defective vitality had given rise. Nations, as well as

individuals, have their infancy and minority, and during these periods they are necessarily in leading strings. Madame de Stael asserts that "liberty is ancient in the world, and that it is despotism which is new." Is this indeed so? The most ancient form of government, the form which prevailed among nomadic and pastoral tribes, was the patriarchal form, and in it the head of the family was certainly a despot, though a paternal one. He had absolute right of life and death over his wife and children and servants, who belonged to him quite as much as his ox or his ass.

Moreover, if we examine closely the history of the nations of antiquity, even that of the so called republics, we shall find that they were really under the regimen of despotism, either military, oligarchic or senatorial.

Liberty can only be the concomitant of advanced civilization. A French philosopher, de Maistre, has rightly said "that liberties are not given, they are taken"—and they can only be taken in communities where civilization has developed the self recognition of the individual.

The Hanseatic Towns, Novgorod was one of them, were remarkable exceptions to the crushing rule of feudal despotism that prevailed in Europe during the middle ages. Commerce is the great resolvent of barbarism and ignorance and these flourishing commercial centers, seem to have stolen a march in civilization on their neighbors. Accordingly they arrogated the liberty of constituting themselves into independent republics, and despotic feudal lords were forced to concede the franchises exacted by these sub-

jects. Unfortunately for "my lord Novgorod the Great" political liberty degenerated into anarchy, and then the great Republic's doom was sealed. "Sometimes, writes Mackenzie Wallace, it was a contest between rival families, sometimes it was a struggle between the municipal aristocracy and the common people who wished to have a larger share in the government. A State thus divided could not long resist the aggressive tendencies of powerful neighbors, Novgorod must fall under the yoke of the Lithuanian Poles or of the Muscovite Princes. The great families inclined to the former, the clergy and the people to the latter." These internal causes of decadence seem to be overlooked by writers, who see only in the fallen Novgorod, a monument of Ivan the Terrible's execrable barbarity, when he made a terrible example of the traitorous citizens of Novgorod.

Russia, as it has been presented to our consideration by some writers, appears a monstrous anachronism, and her sovereigns are described as modern Neros, or little better. The impartial mind, however, will find in a brief consideration of Russia's origin and early history, the explanation of her tardy development; for, as Freeman has remarked, "the present will be very imperfectly understood, unless the light of the past is brought to bear upon it."

Have we not all seen unfortunate creatures who carry to the grave traces of mishaps that have befallen their cradles? And what are the accidents of heredity but new proofs of the necessity of reading the present in the light of the past?

Moreover, slow development is the law of certain organisms, and not always of inferior ones, by any means. The chicken's notions of perspective and distance are as fully developed, the first day of its existence, as they are capable of being developed; whereas, the human animal blunders along in space for a long while, making many painful experiences from false perspective, and is many years in acquiring the full complement of his physical and mental equipment. It is noteworthy, too, that the children of savages are far more precocious, and arrive at maturity more rapidly than those of civilized races; and Sir James Crichton Browne ably contends that the higher the degree of culture to be attained, the longer must be the process of training, the more arduous must be the apprenticeship. When the illustrious painter of the "Last Judgment" had reached the advanced age of eighty, he drew a sketch of himself in a child's go-cart, with this legend beneath, "*ancora imparo*,"—still he learns.

When we consider the immense disadvantages under which Russia has labored, the crudities and the anomalies of her civilization will no longer surprise and shock us. Our wonder will be, not that she is behindhand in some things, but that she should already have done so much towards retrieving the past, and have become a leading factor in the politics of Europe, to-day, and perhaps the arbiter of its destinies in the future. In reading the story of the past, we shall also see that Russia's ambitious views, regarding Constantinople, are by no means of recent date.

"They have grown with her growth and strength-

ened with her strength." There can be but little doubt that she intends to have no limits to her empire than those which bounded the empire of the Western Cæsars, and the chances that she will ultimately succeed are strong in her favor. Whether therein consists a terrible menace to the world; whether the realization of her projects will be the knell of civilization, as some writers seem to fear, is, to say the least, an open question.

Nations cannot remain stationary on the plane of civilization. When they cease to advance, they retrograde, and their decadence has already begun. Now he who runs may read that the movement in Russia since fifty years has been decidedly progressive, and any unprejudiced observer must be struck with the advances she has made in the way of liberal reforms and education, in spite of the difficulties arising from the absolutism of the government and many other causes. "Ever since Peter the Great's appearance among them, says Carlyle, they have been in steady progress of development. In our own time they have done signal service to God and man, in drilling into order and peace anarchic population all over their side of the world."

Absolutism, or in other words autocracy, is a natural and normal growth of the Russian soil, as I shall endeavor to show later on. It is autocracy, plus bureaucracy, by no means indigenous that constitutes the redoubtable problem of Russian politics to-day.

When enlightened well intentioned autocrats have sought to introduce ameliorations, they have found

themselves taken in the toils that absolutism has woven around them. All powerful when they wish to indulge a caprice, their action is singularly neutralized in the sphere of good. For, however paradoxical the assertion may appear, the supreme power is not in the hands of the Czar but in the bureaucracy. The Czar can do nothing without them and nothing against them, for though imperial disgrace may strike individual members, it cannot strike the whole body without entirely changing the system of government.

Thus the instrument is stronger than the hand that wields it, and many good projects fail before the inertia and ill-will of red tapeism opposed to progress, or intent on self aggrandisement. The guarantee of publicity not existing, the personal vigilance of the sovereign can alone secure the execution of his wishes, and in a vast empire like Russia, this vigilance cannot be ubiquitous.

Consequently, a great hiatus seems, at times, to exist between the legislative and executive powers, and disastrous results are produced, such as the conspiracies of 1825 and 1848, and more recent outrages perpetrated by the nihilists—then follows a great re-action. The reprisals of autocracy on the one hand, while on the other, the nation sinks discouraged into oriental lethargy and fatalism, resigning itself to evils which seem irremediable. Autocrats are human after all. They love their lives as other mortals do, and when they are tracked down like wild beasts, because they could not accomplish all the good they desired, or accomplished it imperfectly, we cannot wonder, if

to protect themselves they fall back upon the means devised by tyranny.

These cowardly stabs in the dark, perpetrated by rabid patriotism, are in themselves proof, that the nation is still unfit for any other form of government. Can we imagine a people redeemed and reconstituted by a band of semi-lunatics, wrecking trains and launching bombshells with a grandiloquent "Sic semper tyrannis?"

Every one knows and deplores the evils of the present system of administration and realizes more or less distinctly that they can only be remedied by giving the people a larger share in the government, thus throwing down the wall of bureaucracy which is interposed between them and the Czar, and prevents his acquiring a true knowledge of their needs.

But the first and most essential condition for a representative government is the intelligent co-operation of the people, and it is impossible to obtain this co-operation from those who have never heard political questions discussed and have not the remotest idea of the intricacies of governmental problems. Projects of self government can only be realized safely, and for the real good of the masses, when education has established a certain general level in the nation.

If the assassination of Alexander the Second (1881,) had not prevented the promulgation of the Constitution with which he was about to endow the nation, it is more than probable that we should have seen repeated, on a larger scale, the experiences of the "Mirs."

In these rural democracies, whose assemblies, like

the American Town Meetings, are the original unit and germ of self-government by the people, sharp witted, ci-devant serfs, having acquired wealth and learning, often used both to the detriment of their poor, benighted fellow villagers, over whom they tyrannized to such an extent, as office bearers of the community, that recently, the Czar, urged by the complaints of the peasants, has found it expedient to establish rural chiefs of districts, chosen among the landed gentry. This was a benevolent measure, devised entirely for the benefit of the poor peasants, but it has, of course, been misconstrued into an act of tyranny, tending to destroy the ancient liberties of the village communes.

In the course of this work I have endeavored to indicate some of the causes that have retarded Russia, and why the nation is still in swaddling clothes, or at best, in leading strings. Until it outgrows them, autocracy must continue to bear the unenviable burden of omnipotence and unshared responsibility, while echoing the sigh of Frederick the Great, who exclaimed towards the close of, his long and eventful reign: "Reigning over a nation of slaves is a wearisome task indeed."

Like many strong personalities, Russia has bitter detractors as well as enthusiastic admirers, even among her own sons, for nowhere do we see greater divergence of opinion than among Russian writers themselves. Foreigners are apt to judge superficially from the limited point of preconceived notions, as time and opportunity are often lacking for accurate observation. When they have seen St. Petersburg and its

society, they flatter themselves that they know the whole country, though a Russian writer has pithily remarked, that St. Petersburg was built by Peter the Great, to be a window through which he might look out upon Europe; but it is by no means a window through which strangers can examine Russia, (Madame Novikoff.)

The heart of this great Empire throbs in every rural commune; its head is nowhere, and St. Petersburg might be swept away to-morrow, without causing any great inconvenience to the nation. Moreover, travelers who hurry through the country by steam, with the purpose of "interviewing" it, are at a greater disadvantage than ever, unless they happen to be familiar with the Russian language, which is now universally used, even in fashionable circles, where French was *de rigueur* some twenty years ago; and it is not every one who has the frankness to say, as Mr. Stead does: "I have only been two months in the country, "I cannot speak six words of the language of the people. The whole of my previous training, political, "religious and social, has been such as to render it "difficult to occupy the standpoint from which these "questions should be judged, that is, from the standpoint of the Russians themselves."

Recently a Russian naval officer was forcibly ejected from the elevated cars in New York, because on his way home from the theatre one night, he had innocently lighted a cigarette on the platform. The outrage on his liberty seemed so preposterous to him, that on the following day he lodged a complaint at the consulat of his country, and was, with difficulty,

made to understand that the prohibition of smoking on these platforms was a rule against which no one in this free country ever thought of rebelling. Yet this same Russian at home, probably, submitted without a second thought, to usages which are constantly provoking indignant protestations on the part of those who visit Russia.

This is a trivial incident, but it shows how necessary it is to look at things from the right standpoint, if we would form a just appreciation. Anglo-Saxons, unfortunately, are remarkably incapable of measuring things otherwise than by their own ell. National prejudice is one of the strongest of passions, though quite impersonal, and no passion is more blind and more blinding. It leads men to prevaricate unconsciously, and is generally accompanied, moreover, by an arrogant, self-complacent contempt for all that does not come up to their own national standards.

Independently, however, of bad faith, inadequate knowledge, and the desire to pander to a morbid taste for the sensational, there are several reasons for the divergency of opinions that are expressed, and the discrepancy of statements that are made regarding Russia.

Not the least important of these reasons is the fact that the country is in a state of transition, so that what may be affirmed truly one day may be false the next. Like her frontiers, Russia's physiognomy is always changing, and it is not easy to delineate the fitful expressions of her ever varying countenance.

The most contradictory statements may, therefore, be equally true, in some respects, and even while

adhering strictly to truth, the writer may give an entirely false impression to the public. To do this, it is only necessary to separate the wheat from the chaff, and present either to the exclusion of the other; or, as is often done, to describe as actual and general, what is true, only of certain epochs, or certain individuals. Russophobists of different nations have exploited these methods *ad infinitum* in a vast amount of prison literature and Nihilist martyrology. Absolute impartiality in the choice of subject matter, and in the manner of treating it, is, no doubt, a most exceptional quality, almost as rare as the blossoming of the century plant. But the intelligent reader can always strike a fair average by acquainting himself, as soon as possible, with the bias of the author, and then taking what he says at a premium, or at a discount, as the case may require.

A condemned criminal's estimate of his judges can hardly be considered a fair basis whereon to found our own, and it seems incomprehensible, that men and women of no mean intelligence should be so entirely guided in the formation of their opinions regarding Russia, by the statements and descriptions of writers, whose hatred and passion are patent to the most cursory reader; men with whom the mot d'ordre seems to be the same, which Voltaire gave to his followers in the crusade against religion: "Mentez, mentez, sans cesse, il en restera toujours quelque chose:" ("Lie, lie, without ceasing, something will always remain.") Why, indeed, should those who resort to dynamite and murder to forward their ends, scruple about lying? And as the French philosopher ob-

serves: "Something always remains." A bitter prejudice is created in the minds of many against a country about which they really have no definite information, and know absolutely nothing but what has been derived from the most questionable sources. Travelers who enter Russia, particularly the Siberian provinces, with the averred purpose of finding "black spots," wherewithal they propose to feather their nests, are apt to have their vision obfuscated by "black spots," like atrocious subjects.

Nations, like individuals, have their family skeletons, no doubt. Every subject, too, has its seamy side, though to be always dwelling on it is somewhat like constantly applying the lens and the magnifying glass to the wart on a great man's forehead, by way of making people acquainted with his character and career, when there are many more desirable means of informing the mind, which might be employed.

The following passage is extracted *verbatim* from the New York Times, (February 14th, 1889,) and refers to the Grammar School, No. 9, West 81st street:

"The rooms for the primary department are situated on the ground, and the floors are so cold that the children and the teachers suffer continually with aching feet and limbs. The largest room is 18 by 20, and into this seventy-five children are crowded. In one of the rooms forty-two children are seated in a space twelve feet square," etc.

We could refer to similar and even to more revolting details regarding other public schools, prisons and lunatic asylums in some of the richest cities of this

great Republic ; and yet it would hardly be fair for foreign writers to take up these texts and dilate upon them, *ad nauseam*, as if there were no palliations, no exceptions which might be alleged.

Although the cases are not exactly parallel, the treatment Russia has received at the hands of some English and American writers is not less unfair. The deplorable condition of some of her prisons, that of Tiumen in particular, has been made the subject of minute description and unsparing animadversion, while of the new and admirable establishments which have been erected at immense cost, in spite of straitened means, little or nothing is said, or at best, they are sneeringly referred to as Russia's "show prisons." Why do not these writers, at least, inform the public that it was the suppression of corporal punishment that led to the overcrowding of prisons in Russia, and that if the Russians were to hang all their murderers, as is generally done among other nations, reputed more humane, the problem of want of space would be greatly simplified ?

Knouting was never as shocking to the Russian mind as it is to ours, albeit that whipping posts and pillories lingered in our midst for a good many centuries. In former days when a man was convicted of stealing, for instance, in Russia, and the local prison happened to be full, he received a knouting, supposed to be commensurate with the offense, and he was forthwith dismissed. On the other hand, however, the Russians have a Bhudistic horror of taking life. Capital punishment, which was introduced by the Tartars and adopted by the Grand Dukes of Moscow,

is never resorted to except in extreme cases, and the power of sentencing to death is the prerogative of the Czar, in his quality of lieutenant of the divinity. For, notwithstanding, the enormity of the anachronism, Russia is still, to all intents and purposes, a theocracy.

The Director in Chief of the Russian prisons is as humane and philanthropic, as any member of the Howard Society, to which he belongs I believe, and he is doing his utmost to ameliorate the condition of the criminal classes. Much more would have been done if Frank and Saxon had not combined in the cause of injustice and Moslem inhumanity, to drain the coffers of a nation who has so freely poured forth her life blood on the altar of freedom, on behalf of oppressed fellow Slavs.

The admirable care and humanity with which steamers have been constructed for transporting convicts from Odessa to Saghalien can certainly compare favorably with the manner in which English and French criminals were packed off to Australia and Cayenne, like so much cargo or ballast, stowed away in the holds of sailing vessels. And this, at a time, when these two nations were considered the most civilized and wealthiest in the world, and were certainly able to afford better accommodation for transporting their unfortunate condemned ones to the penal settlements.

Even figures and hard facts are not all sufficient for informing the mind correctly, there are many concomitant circumstances which alter cases, and when these are suppressed, the mind may be misled quite as much as if absolute deceit had been practised upon it.

It is easy to harrow the public mind with statements about laborers who receive only a few cents a day, live on black bread and cabbage soup, breathe foul air and so on and so on. But what if, owing to secular habits and the difference of monetary value, they are no worse off than English or American wage workers who starve and strike on twenty-five times the amount?

Mr. George Kennan, whose articles have been widely circulated in the Century Magazine, has done his best to enlist the sympathies of the American public on behalf of the unfortunate political exiles, justly or unjustly implicated in Nihilistic outbreaks but he does not remind his readers that most of the harrowing cases with which he points his articles, somewhat irrelevantly at times, belong to periods when Nihilism was in the heyday of its reign of terror. When incendiary conflagrations, conspiracies and assassinations were of such frequent occurrence, that they left little room for considerations of humanity and moderation. Martial law prevailed at these periods; conspirators were tried by military tribunals, as the apologists of Nihilism are themselves careful to inform us; and "*inter arma silent leges*" is a well known axiom.

The Rev. Dr. Lansdell, who in his extremely interesting work, "Through Siberia," goes over the same ground as Mr. Kennan, and Harry de Windt, a more recent traveler, seem to have seen things in a very different light, and by no means from the same standpoint. Nor do the experiences which Baron Rosen, a political exile, has described in his "Con-

spirators in Siberia," seem to have been at all like those of Herzen, Dragomonoff (Stepniak) and other alleged eye-witnesses. Though of course no one would, for an instant, think of impugning the veracity of any of these gentlemen.

The circumstance of time is also an important consideration, which must never be overlooked in speaking of Russia, for as we have remarked, what is perfectly true one day may be equally false the next. In 1882 Dostoievski's "House of the Dead, or Ten Years in Siberia," was published in England and produced a great sensation. No dates being given in this narrative, which purports to be the diary of a convict, the public were easily led to believe that many revolting details, therein contained, were true pictures of the existing state of things in Siberia. Yet the fact is, that Dostoievski having been implicated in the conspiracy of Petrachevski, was banished to Siberia in 1848, and it is to this distant period that his narrative refers.

Russia has been, until recently, one century, at least, behind hand; this is an indisputable fact, but it is equally true that since fifty years, she has lived by steam. Many a race has been won on the home stretch, and it certainly looks as if this might be the experience of the great young empire of the Russian-Cæsars.

CHAPTER II.

RUSSIA'S ORIGIN AND EARLY CIVILIZATION.

Though forming part of Europe, geographically, Russia has developed in conditions, which were in no-wise analogous to those of other European nations. Among these nations modern institutions are the evolutions of slowly matured germs. Sublimation, not precipitation, has been the process of their formation. Russia, unfortunately, had no roots in the past which were not torn up over and over again; no middle ages, no middle classes, who are the great strength of a nation, and when occasion calls for it, a powerful lever in the hands of Reformers. She must hastily supplement the deficiencies of her early life, like a man suddenly called upon to play a part for which he has received no adequate training. She must rapidly adjust herself to the equipments of modern civilization, without having undergone the apprenticeship of centuries. Time, the great educator of nations, has been to her but a rude task-master; no painful experience has been spared her, and yet the deficiencies of her education are numerous. During the first four centuries of the Christian era the plains of Sarmatia, the site of the future Russian Empire, were nothing but a highway for the barbarian hordes from Asia and the north of Europe, who deluged Europe and overthrew the Roman Empire.

These ancestors of the nations of modern Europe

reaped many advantages from the civilization they had supplanted. The Justinian code had already laid the foundations of their legislation; and Saint Denys, the Areopogite, Saint Irene, Saint Pothin and other missionaries had already evangelized the Gauls and the Britons, when some Slav tribes settled on the banks of the Dneiper, in the basin of the Danube, and in other parts of Europe. Many of these Slavs were, in all probability, descended from the Scyths whom Herodotus described four centuries before Christ.

The early records of the Western Slavs are neither numerous nor authentic. It is certain, however, that they were of Aryan descent. Comparative tables of able philologists like Max Müller, prove that among Indo-European languages the Slavonian has the closest resemblance with the Sanskrit; indeed, there is less difference between them than there is between ancient and modern Greek. Name the Veda to a Russian peasant and it will be a familiar word. If he should speak to you of fire he will use the same word used by his ancestors when they worshipped this element. Fire was worshipped by the ancient Slavs under the name of Ogon (Ogina in the oblique case,) answering to the Vedic Ognî, while their principal divinities were the Vedic Veruna and Velos the Sun God. As among the Hindoos of India, cremation was in use among the early Slavs, as well as the Suttee; the widows resigning themselves to perish on the funeral pile or in the bark of their defunct husbands. An Arabian traveler in the ninth century has left a curious description of the ceremonies of cremation, as practiced among the Slavs. "While the funeral pile was flaming,"

says the narrator, "one of them said to me, "You Arabs are fools. You bury the one you most love and he is the prey of worms; we, on the contrary, burn them in the twinkling of an eye, that they may go to Paradise as quickly as possible." "Many Russian philosophers, writes de Vogué, profess the doctrines of Budha, and glory in their Aryan descent. "You strangers, they say, will never understand the doctrines of the old Aryans; you are only their collaterals, we are their lineal descendants."

The origin of the word Slav is very uncertain, but it has given rise to the words slave, esclave, esclavo, schiavo, owing to the state of degradation to which most of the Slavs were reduced in Europe. The Western Slavs, however, maintained their independence and attained a certain degree of civilization. Small townships arose, rude forms of municipal government were established, which have, more or less, survived the shocks of many centuries, and may yet be the "grain of mustard seed" out of which will grow the great tree of political liberty for Russia in the future. Archaeologists have found in Russia a multitude of monuments resembling those left by the Toltec races in America, and which Samokvassof has shown to be the remains of the primitive cities (Oppida) of the ancient Slavs. Excavations made among the earthen outworks and the funeral mounds which surround them have revealed potteries, instruments of iron, bronze, gold, silver and glass, and pieces of Eastern money bearing the date 699. In a vase discovered near Novgorod were found about 7,000 rubles worth of these coins. The swords made by the Slavs were re-

nowned in Arabia long before those of Toledo in Spain, and Nestor records, that the Khagars imposed a tribute of swords on the Polians, a Slav tribe whom they had subdued.

But the progress of this precocious civilization was arrested by tribal dissensions, which resulted in foreign intervention. About the year 850 some Northmen, calling themselves Russes, or sons of Rurick, established their headquarters at Novgorod,—by right of conquest, according to some, though the generality of historians say, that they had been invited by the Slavs, who, wearied of the state of permanent anarchy in which they lived. “Let us look for a prince who will govern with justice,” said the Slavs of Illmen, worn out by dissensions and civil wars. And then, says Nestor, the Tchoudes, the Krivitches and others united, and said to the Vareg princes: “Our country is vast, and we have all things in abundance, except order and justice; come and govern us.” Some writers pretend that these Varegs were Slavs from the Baltic coast, but the probabilities are, that they were pure Northmen or Scandinavians. For about ten years ago Samakovossov opened an ancient tomb, containing the remains of one of these warrior princes of the tenth century, and it was found, that the coat of mail and helmet were entirely similar to those represented on the famous tapestries of Bayeux, worked by Mathilda, wife of William the Conqueror, Duke of Normandy, which province, we know, was conquered and settled by the Northmen, in the eighth and ninth centuries. If the Varegs came as invited guests, their occupation of the country was very much the same as that of the

Saxons in Britain. The foundations of the future Russian Empire were laid; the house of Rurick became the reigning house, and has governed Russia ever since, the Romanoffs, who ascended the throne in 1681, being descended from Rurick by the female branch.

The Northmen were by no means a pastoral and agricultural race like the Slavs. They were essentially ambitious and aggressive, witness their domination in France and in England. And though the Slavs, with the remarkable faculty of assimilation which still distinguishes them, absorbed their conquerors, instead of being absorbed by them, as the Britons were by the Saxons, the infusion of this new element gave a different direction to their development. At this early period of their history begins the long series of Russia's conquests, which is still far from being closed.

Having heard of the beautiful city of the Cæsars on the Bosphorus, the Russes floated down the Dneiper in their rude barks, nothing but the hollow trunks of birch and oak. They took Kieff on the way, and arrived at Constantinople, where the Greeks and the Emperor Michael, "the drunkard," were disputing about the schism begun by the patriarch Photius. Their presence caused a panic almost as great as that which seized the Romans, when Attila, "the scourge of God," appeared at their gates; the inhabitants of Constantinople were fain to secure immunity by bribing the barbarians with wine and oil, and spices and tissues of all kinds. Meanwhile a violent tempest made havoc with the frail embarkations of the invaders, and they decamped in haste. The Byzantine

legend tells us that the patriarch Photius took the "miraculous robe of our Lady of Blacherun, plunged it "into the Bosphorus, and a mighty tempest arose."

Messudi, an Arabian writer, thus records this first expedition of the Russes to Byzance: "At the beginning of the fourth century of the Hegira came about 500 ships of Russians, each carrying a hundred men, and ran into the arm of the Mit (Azof) which is connected with the Khagars River. They sent to the king of the Khagars asking leave to pass through his land and to sail down his river into the Khagar Sea, in which case they promised to give him, on their return, half the booty they might bring back."

In 904, Oleg, uncle of Igor, made a new expedition to Constanstinople. He found the Bosphorus defended, but, with the calm determination of his race, he was not to be deterred by so small an obstacle. The Russes shouldered their light canoes, crossed the isthmus which connects Constantinople with the mainland, (as did Mahomed II some centuries later,) sailed up the Golden Horn, and suspended their shields on the walls of the Imperial City. It is said that they were an army of 80,000, and that their barks numbered 20,000. The Emperor, Leon the Philosopher, whose philosophy was quite unequal to the emergency, hastened to treat with the invaders; and the successor of Constantine the Great, and a thousand Cæsars became the tributary of a band of pirates.

The tribute was not forthcoming in season, it seems, for in 941, Igor, the Charlemagne of Russia, whose exploits have been sung in many popular ballads, came in person to claim his due, while Constantine VII was

struggling against the Saracens, and endeavoring to repress the revolt of Lecapemus, an ambitious general. The moment was favorable, and the chronicler, Nestor, tells us that "Igor would have taken Constantinople there and then, if the elders of his council had not represented to him, that their nation was still unorganized and without a stable government; so that, though they could easily take and pillage Constantinople, they were not yet able to keep it." The policy of conquerors has not always been marked by so much prudence, and if this episode be illustrative of Russian diplomacy, from first to last, the world may some day feel the preponderance of a nation, that matures its projects with Oriental slowness and protracted caution, but never relinquishes them.

The Emperor Constantine, in Byzantine fashion, offered the Russes money to become his allies against the Bulgarians and the Thracians; and while they were occupied in this mission, a hostile tribe of Slavs besieged Kieff at the instigation of the Greeks. At the same time Jean Zimicès attacked them at Preslau and Adrianople, and the Russian invaders were forced to evacuate the country.

Even after their conversion to Christianity the Russians continued to be feared and distrusted by the Western Cæsars. Many Slav colonies remained established in Thracia, the Peloponnesus and Attica, and the formation of a Slav confederation so near the gates of Constantinople, appeared to the Greek Emperors, as much fraught with danger as the growing power of the Bulgarians; for, a prophetic inscription, hidden in the iron boot of an equestrian statue, announced "that

“men from the North would one day take possession of the capital of the Empire.”

During her sojourn in Byzance, (955-973,) Olga, the mother of Sviastolf, had become a Christian with some of her household, but she could not persuade her sons to follow her example. “My soldiers will turn me into ridicule,” objected Sviastolf. His warriors, it is true, were, as a rule, very ill disposed towards the Christian religion, and, like the Northmen in France, they particularly enjoyed pillaging monasteries and torturing priests. Nor was the tendency of public opinion as yet such that the example of the Chief would be readily followed by the people, as it was some years later.

It was not till 980 that diplomacy moved the inert conscience of these pagans and decided them to embrace the Greek schism, after having long remained insensible to solicitations from Roman Catholics, Mahometans and Jews. Affinity of religion identifying them with the Greeks, Constantinople would more easily accept their yoke when the time came for them to supplant the Cæsars. Tales are told of visions and miracles, but it may safely be said that it was the practical side of the question which most appealed to the rulers. Accordingly baptisms were administered wholesale on the banks of the Dneiper; the Russes followed the example of their Grand Prince Vladimir, and became Christians of the Schism of Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople or Greek Catholics, much as the subjects of Clovis, of Witikind and of Egbert became Roman Catholics.

The conversion of the nation was cemented by the

marriage of Vladimir with Anne, sister of the Greek Emperor, Basil II. This amiable princess exchanged the society of a highly civilized court for the semi-barbarous capital of the Russes. But she soon transformed Kieff into another Constantinople, and so great was the esteem in which she was held that the daughters of her son Yarsolof were sought in marriage by Kings of Norway, of France, and of Poland. During her reign pagan idols were destroyed, Christian churches were built, and learning and the arts received every encouragement. Indeed, Russia at this time was far from being inferior to the rest of Europe. But her civilization was wholly Oriental, borrowed from Asia and from Constantinople. This civilization, too, was only a phase in her history, and it was destined to be swept away by the bitter waters of a foreign inundation.

The Christian religion slowly modified the character and customs of the nation, but pagan practices and Christian dogmas long subsisted side by side. The people clung tenaciously to their heathen superstitions, and it is even asked if they do not still survive, at least in the hearts of some of the ignorant peasantry. The establishment of Christianity was a pledge of Russia's admission, at some future day into the fellowship of other European nations, but the fact of her having received this religion from schismatic Constantinople, and not from Rome, placed Russia, for many centuries, outside the pale of European civilization and progress. At the present day it is this difference of creed, however slight, that divides Greek and Roman Catholics in the Balkan Peninsula, and is

one of the chief obstacles to the formation of a great Slav confederation under the hegemony of the Czar.

If, on the one hand schismatic Russia was spared the long struggles between the secular power and a foreign spiritual power, which mark the annals of England, France and the Germanic empire during the middle ages, she also forfeited the material assistance she would have received in her hour of need from the Vatican and the Latin Christians against her Tartar dominators during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.

CHAPTER III.

TARTAR DOMINATION.

Vladimir established a fatal precedent, when he divided the kingdom among his seven sons, and under his successors the power of the throne was further weakened by repeated partitions of the country among princes of the house of Rurick, each of whom sought, like Vladimir, to provide for all his sons.

This unnatural division and subdivision of a country possessing no natural barriers, and which was evidently designed by nature to be one united empire, led to interminable civil wars. According to ancient Slav custom, a defunct prince must be succeeded, not by his son, but by the eldest member of his family, uncle, brother, or cousin; the Byzantine laws, on the contrary, which had been introduced with Christianity, required that the son, and not the head of the family, inherit from his father. And in consequence of the struggle between the old and the new systems, every succession was a disputed one, and gave rise to a small War of the Roses. From 1054, death of Yarsolof the Great, Russia's legislator, par excellence, to the Tartar invasion, 1224, Pogodine enumerates sixty-four principalities more or less short-lived, two hundred and ninety-three princes and eighty-three civil wars. Kieff long maintained her supremacy, as the only Grand Princedom, but during the Tartar domination,

the sceptre passed to Sousdalia, the future Grand Duchy of Moscow.

In the midst of the *pêle mêle* of the civil wars, Novgorod, already great by her commerce, established her independence. The Novgorodians only tolerated a prince, because innate Slav anarchy seemed to need some such corrective. But at least, they meant to maintain the right of choosing their prince, and showing him the door very politely if he did not strictly conform to their many injunctions, and submit to the restrictions of his very limited civil and judicial powers. The figure of his revenues, and the sources whence they were to be derived, were regulated, and he was not allowed to acquire landed property, nor even to hunt in the woods, nor reap his harvests except at stated seasons. The office of Prince of Novgorod was not, on the whole, a very desirable distinction, and as may be easily supposed, it often went begging. During the seven years which preceded the Mongol conquest, not less than five princes were deposed or abdicated.

The Vetché, or governing Assembly, was the real sovereign of Novgorod. Like the "*liberum veto*" of the Polish Diet, the decisions of the Vetché always required the unanimity of votes, and this was obtained, if necessary, by throwing the minority into the Volkhof. Sometimes, too, an anti-Vetché arose, and the two Vetchés decided their rival differences by a hand to hand fight on the bridge, which spanned the Volkhof. The Novgorodians enjoyed immunity from the civil wars of succession, which were always raging in the other principalities, but civic dissensions and the

strife of rival factions were endemic among themselves, and led to the fall of their republic, to which we have alluded elsewhere. Under the protecting wing of "My Lord Novgorod the Great," the republics of Pskof and Viatka were established, and went through similar experiences as the parent city; they were all subdued and united under the scepter of the Grand Dukes of Moscow. A country thus divided was the self-adjudged spoil of foreign invaders. The Russians were attacked and vanquished by the Tartars on the east and on the south; by the Poles and Lithuanians on the west and on the north.

"At this time, say the Slav chronicles, for the punishment of our sins, there came some unknown people, no one knew their origin nor whence they came, nor what religion they professed. God only knows, and perhaps the wise men versed in book lore." Even Italy, France and Germany were panic-stricken by the arrival of these hordes. *Sieur de Joinville*, the chronicler of the reign of Saint Louis, (the ninth) thought they were Gog and Magog of the Bible, who were to come at the end of the world, when anti-Christ was to destroy all things."

About the year 1224, Genghis Khan, an Asiatic warrior chief, succeeded after forty years' struggle, in imposing his authority on all the semi-barbarous tribes who belonged to the Mongolian race, and peopled the table lands of Central Asia, south of the Altai Mountains. He conquered Mandchuria, China, Turkestan, nearly the whole of Asia, in fact, and his empire was the most extensive that has ever existed. It was with this formidable enemy that the sons of Rurick had to con-

tend ; but they were not subjugated without a struggle. They offered a brave resistance and only succumbed at last, to overwhelming numerical force. One by one the chief towns of the south and east were taken, burnt and pillaged, and the inhabitants put to the sword, without distinction of age or sex. When the Persian invaders sent word to Leonidas and his brave companions to surrender their arms, "Come and take them," replied the hero of Thermopyle. Not less Spartan like was the rejoinder of the Princes of Moscow, Riazan, Mouron and Prousk. "If you wish peace, said the ambassadors of Genghis Khan, give us one-tenth of all you possess." "When we are dead, was the answer, you can take the whole." And the carnage continued. "Russian heads, says the Chronicle, were mowed down like the grass of the field, while thousands were led away into captivity.

Neither Genghis Khan nor his successors, proposed to subject themselves to the inclemencies of the Russian climate, but they established baskakes, or receivers of tribute, in the different provinces, where the extortions of these tax gatherers often drove the people to rebellions, which were cruelly suppressed. Beside the tribute money, the vanquished were bound to furnish a military contingent to their dominators, and, in the moral decadence which followed, it was not unusual to see them fighting side by side with Tartars, against their own compatriots. In concert with them, Andrew, son of the saintly Alexander Nevaski, devastated the provinces of Vladimir and Sousdalia, (1281) and in 1327 we see the princes of Vladimir and Sousdalia, helping the Tartars to sack and burn Tver.

Baty Khan, Genghis Khan's generalissimo in Russia, built at the mouth of the Volga, Serai, (Astrakan) which became the capital of the Tartars of the Golden Horde, when they shook off their allegiance to the successors of Genghis, and established an independent empire. Thither the Russian princes were forced to repair to do homage for their domains, and obtain permission to govern, which they could never do until they had received the "iarlik" of investiture. They deemed themselves fortunate, too, if they were not summoned to the court of the Grand Khan, at the other extremity of Asia, and which meant a journey of two years, from whence many never returned. The Russian princes could not engage in any war without the Khan's permission, and when the Tartar ambassadors brought them communications from their foreign masters, they were obliged to go on foot to meet them, to spread a precious carpet under the feet of these messengers, and listen, on their knees, to the reading of the communication.

At the Court of the Golden Horde, the princes grovelled at the feet of their Asiatic masters, but only to crush down their own subjects under the iron heel of despotism, when they returned. As Karamsin justly observes; "The liberty of a nation cannot exist when their rulers are the slaves of a foreign power." The old landmarks of civilization and freedom disappeared one by one. The Vetchés were suppressed; the people no longer chose their civil and military magistrates; and indeed, we may say, that every trace of law and liberty was obliterated. "When wolves fight, sheep lose their wool," says a Russian

proverb, and such has been the experience of this unfortunate nation, in more than one instance.

At the Court of the Golden Horde, the dissensions of rival princes were arbitrated by the Khans, and, by dint of bribery and servility, the Grand Dukes of Moscow (Sousdalia) obtained territorial supremacy. "The princes of Moscow, says Karamsin, took the humble title of servants of the Khan, and thus they became powerful monarchs."

Solovief pretends that the Tartar domination but little affected the character and development of the Russians. However, I incline to the judgment of Kostomarof, Karamsin and other historians, as it seems more reliable in this matter. These writers attribute a considerable influence for evil to the thralldom of the nation to Moslem masters. For more than two centuries the Russians were crushed beneath the Mongol yoke, the slaves of a nation of slaves; and, like all nations subjected to rāia domination, they still bear the stigma of the yoke. Here the masses learnt the uncomplaining endurance which distinguishes them, and were schooled to a serfdom still more bitter which awaited them.

Here, too, were learnt those lessons of duplicity, cruelty, venality and corruption, which it is so difficult to unlearn. Nor was this all. There was a considerable infusion of Tartar blood into the native race, among the upper classes chiefly, perpetuating the evils of pernicious examples, and naturalizing the vices of these barbarians, who arrived Pagans, but soon became fervent Moslems. Boris Godonof, whose name was accursed by many generations of Moujiks, was of Tartar origin.

During this period, the National Church acquired immense power and wealth. The Khans, recognizing the influence of the clergy over the people, sought to ingratiate themselves with the former, by according them many privileges and immunities, while the people, seeing the favor enjoyed by their spiritual leaders with their common masters, sought the protection and patronage of the clergy by gifts and services. The wealthy classes meanwhile, thought they could not better employ their riches than by endowing churches and monasteries, as was the case at the time of the "religious terror" of the millenium in France and Germany during the Middle Ages. It is just, however, to recognize that the clergy of the Greek Church in Russia always employed their influence and ascendancy on behalf of their countrymen, and that they were unremitting in their efforts to keep alive the smouldering flame of hope and patriotism in the hearts of prince and people.

When the Grand Duke, Dimitri Donskoi faltered in his perilous enterprise of expelling the Tartars from the basin of the Don, it was the clergy who urged him on to victory by every argument that heaven and earth could furnish. In 1612, in 1812, in every solemn hour of great national peril, and for Russia there have been many, the clergy have always been foremost in courage and patriotism.

No wonder, then, that indestructible bonds were established between the Russian people and their church; that Orthodoxy is for the masses, another name for Fatherland, hearth and home, and that Orthodoxy, this synonym for the Greco-Russian Church

still appeals so strongly to the hearts of all Russians, even of those penetrated by the leaven of Western free-thinking.

During the dark centuries of Moslem domination the National Church was in Russia, as in the whole Balkan Peninsula, the supreme bond of union that held together the scattered and demoralized victims of alien oppression. "Do not laugh too much," said an Athenian of culture and good sense, to Mr. Deschamps, author of "*La Grèce d'aujourd'hui*," at our trivial forms of worship, our "ignorant pappas, and "our lazy and dirty monks. We love our religion as "it is. The Greek people has been preserved in that "religion as fish is preserved in salt."

The Mongol domination entirely separated Russia from all communication with the other European nations, and in this respect these centuries of Tartar domination followed as they were by Polish invasions and the institution of serfdom, immeasurably retarded the progress of Russia. Her only participation in European civilization during the middle ages, had been through the medium of Byzantium in decay; and even the meager stream which used to flow in from Constantinople was cut off when this city fell into the hands of the Turks (1453).

While Russia was struggling to shake off the yoke of her Tartar dominators and then reducing her own sons to bondage, the aurora of a new civilization was dawning for Europe. Chaucer wrote his *Tales*, Spencer sang his *Fairy Queen*, and were followed by a galaxy of poets and prose writers, who lent lustre to the reign of Elizabeth, whom Ivan IV sought in marriage. The

invention of printing, the discovery of America, the reformation of Luther, and many other causes, gave a great impetus to learning, art and literature in Western Europe. But no ray of the great day of the Renaissance penetrated into Russia.

CHAPTER IV.

THE GRAND DUKES OF MOSCOW.

Patriotism at least was not entirely destroyed amid the general demoralization of the nation. Many efforts were made to throw off the foreign yoke, but they only resulted in greater oppression.

However, the vast empire of Genghis Khan was in its turn undergoing the process of disintegration, and the Grand Duke Dimitri Donskoi, taking advantage of the internal dissensions among the Tartars, assembled the forces of the Russian nation and defeated the enemy in several battles, expulsing them from the basin of the Don.

Dimitri, though not naturally inhumane, established corporal and capital punishment as means of repressing anarchy and brigandage and maintaining the exercise of his absolute power. However odious in itself there can be no doubt that in the chaotic condition of affairs which then existed, no milder form of government could have reconstituted a half civilized nation on the verge of dissolution. The history of the Grand Duchy of Moscow, the nucleus of the future Russian Empire, commences, so to speak, at this period.

At the beginning of the thirteenth century, Tamerlane restored the fortunes of the Tartar empire. He reconquered the nations over whom Genghis Khan had reigned, and restored the Mogul domination in

Russia, devastating the City of Moscow in person at the head of a wild horde from the plains of Asia.

It was not until the reign of Iván III (the Great) 1462—1505—that the Tartars were again repulsed, and the Crescent slowly receded from Russian territory. Several feudal principalities were also united under his scepter, and Ivan became the prototype of the future autocrats of Russia.

In 1453, the Turks under Mahomed II conquered the Byzantine capital and established their long domination in the city of the western Cæsars, the Tzaragrad, so coveted by the sons of Rurick. Previous to this event, Jean Palæologus one of the last Greek emperors of Constantinople desiring the help of the Latins against the Turks, had become reconciled with Rome, at the Council of Florence, 1436, where the Credo was sung for the last time in unanimity by the Greek and Latin churches. The patriarch of Constantinople made Isidore, a friend of the Pope, metropolitan of Moscow. But when the latter read the act of union and prayed for his Holiness at the Kremlin, an ominous silence reigned, broken only by the Grand Duke Vasili, who like a true descendant of the Greek emperors, began a theological discussion with the prelate, and ordered that a council of bishops and boyars should examine the act of union. It was rejected, and the metropolitan Isidore was imprisoned in a convent whence he escaped to Rome, where he was made a Cardinal. "He had gone to his Pope, led to his destruction by the devil," said the schismatics.

Notwithstanding this defeat, Pope Paul III, knowing that Ivan had revived the ambitious projects of

his predecessors, which had necessarily been in abeyance during the Tartar domination, and that he was forming designs on Constantinople, offered him the hand of Maria Palæologus, daughter of Thomas Palæologus, and niece and heiress of the last Greek Emperor, Constantine Dragases. The princess (Sophia) had abjured the Greek schism at Rome, taking the name of Maria at her baptism, and the Pope thought that by this alliance he would accomplish a double purpose, expulse the infidels from Constantinople, and bring about the conversion of Ivan, who had become the supporter and chief of the Greek schism, since the fall of the Imperial City.

Ivan was as obdurate as his predecessors in rejecting all overtures of union with Rome, but he willingly espoused the Princess Sophia and her rights to the Byzantine throne. "It was God Himself, he said, "who had sent him this offshoot of the imperial tree, "which formerly covered all orthodox Christendom "with its shadow." To this Greek Princess, whose family had so recently been dethroned by the Turks, vassalage to the Tartars seemed far more intolerable than it did to Russians, accustomed to the foreign yoke; and she continually urged Ivan to destroy the Moslem power. "How much longer am I to be the vassal of the Khan?" was her oft repeated complaint. Sophia Palæologus did for Moscow, what Anne, sister of the Emperor Basil II had done for Kieff. By the fall of Constantinople, Moscow became the metropolis of orthodoxy, and on her, too, devolved henceforth the duty of protecting the Eastern Christians, and avenging the catastrophe of 1453, against Islam.

In 1472 Ivan assumed the arms of the Greek empire, the black eagle with two heads, together with the title of Tzar or Cæsar, and when he sent an ambassador to negotiate a treaty of commerce with the Sultan, he forbade his envoy to bend the knee in the presence of the Moslem potentate. Pletscheff; another envoyé, even refused to dine with the Sultan, saying that "he would not sit at the table of the oppressor of his brethren." Exiled and fugitive Greeks were warmly welcomed at Moscow, particularly men of learning like Theodore Lascaris, his son Demetrius, and Fioraventi Aristote, who was for Ivan III what Lefort was to Peter the Great—architect, engineer and artilleryman. The Greek calendar and alphabet were adopted, Greek manners and customs prevailed. Such was the policy of the Grand Dukes, one well calculated to pave their way to the throne of the Cæsars of Constantinople, when the favorable moment should arrive to enforce their claims.

The defeat of the Tartars, the conquest of Kazan and Astrakhan, and the reunion of several republics and feudal principalities had given to the Grand Dukes the basin of the Don and of the Volga; but they had nothing west of the Dneiper. Alexander, Duke of Lithuania and King of Poland, ruled at Kieff and Smolensk, while Livonia Courland and the whole coast of the Baltic were held by the Knights of the Sword, a branch of the Teutonic Order, whose Grand Master, the Elector of Brandenburg, became King of Prussia towards the end of the seventeenth century.

In 1491 Maxamillian, Emperor of Austria, recog-

nized Ivan II as Czar of Russia, and made with him the treaty of Nuremberg, by which Austria engaged to help Russia against the Poles and Lithuanians, on condition that Ivan should help Austria to conquer Hungary. It was the first time that the descendants of Rurick were admitted into European politics. About a century later Ivan IV (the Terrible,) having been defeated by Stephen Bartori, King of Poland, sought to obtain a favorable treaty by the intervention of the Pope. The all powerful Jesuits had brought about a "Holy League" among Catholic sovereigns for the maintenance of religious unity in Europe, and the opportunity again seemed favorable for terminating the Greek schism. Pope Gregory XIII sent Father Possevino, a famous Italian diplomatist, to negotiate the treaty of Kiverova Horka. Ivan was delighted, but remained inaccessible to overtures of union with Rome. The following passage from "*Moscovia del Possevino*," gives an idea of the pretensions of Russia at this epoch of her history :

"This Jean or Ivan, besides the titles of King of Astrakhan and Kazan, has thought fit to call himself Emperor of Germany in writing to the Sultan, under pretext that he is a descendant of Augustus Cæsar, who used to call himself the "Prussian." It is easy to see what is in his mind regarding the confines of Germany and of Europe. He thinks that all the Catholics whom he calls "Romans" will soon be heretics, and that it will be easy for him to subjugate them and open the way to the conquest of all the rest."

Ivan the Terrible refused all recognition of the King of Sweden, saying, "that it was not suitable

“that he, a descendant of the Cæsars, should treat
“with an elected King of obscure birth, but that the
“latter might confer with the Governor of Moscow,
“if necessary.”

Ivan's cruelty was as great as his ambition. During the latter part of his reign, Russia was steeped in blood, and stories of his maniacal furies are among the facts of Russian history with which foreigners are best acquainted. He was a Henry VIII broken away from the restraints of the Magna Charta and let loose upon a country accustomed to be trodden upon.

Nevertheless, if we would judge these “Great” and “Terrible” Muscovites aright, we must do, what people often forget to do; we must recall the century to which they belonged, and the men and women it has produced, of purpose so stern, of such unflinching and remorseless determination, that they might almost serve as foils to Ivan the Terrible himself. It was the century of Louis the Eleventh, of Catherine de Medici, of Torquemada, of the “She Wolf of France.”

If their “evil manners live in brass,” the work accomplished by these two sovereigns was certainly not “written in water.” And so Titan was their task, that it is probable that no finer instruments or gentler means than those which they employed would have been adequate to the difficulties of the undertaking. Ivan the Great, and Ivan the Terrible, did for Russia what Louis the Eleventh did for France. They crushed the power of the great nobles, whose rival dissensions kept the country in a perpetual state of civil war; and they prepared the way for national unity by conquest and by annexation. For Russia,

even more than for France, this unity was a *sine qua non* of existence and development, the country being evidently destined by nature to be the seat of one vast empire. There exists among the inhabitants of the different regions a mutual dependence which cannot be evaded. The regions of the forests must have the cereals and the animals of the arable steppes, and these fertile steppes of the South are in equal need of the timber from the North. The commerce of the Dwina and the Neva would be crippled without the co-operation of the Dneiper and the Volga.

By substituting autocracy to oligarchic despotism, Ivan III and Ivan IV saved Russia from aristocratic oppression and anarchy, which ruined Poland, and led to her final dismemberment. Muscovite autocracy created the Empire of the Czars, and was itself a natural growth of Russian soil. Long before the advent of Rurick, the stern rigors of their physical condition rendered the Russians forcibly gregarious, and necessitated the patriarchal despotism of the family, of which the absolutism of the Mir was only an extended form, and autocracy the final evolution.

The independent life of the American squatter and backwoodsman would in all times have been impracticable in Russia, where the urgent need of the strength which comes from union was so keenly felt by all, that they unhesitatingly laid aside personal interests, never questioning the law, which requires that in all societies the individual good be made subservient to the general weal of the community. This unlimited capacity for self-sacrifice which still characterizes the great Russians, and seems to be a kind of second

nature with them, is a factor of considerable importance which must never be overlooked by those who would cast the horoscope of the Slav Empire. For, universal history teaches us that self-seeking, the pursuit of personal aggrandizement, the race for filthy lucre, and a complete indifference for the weal of the community at large, are the causes and the precursors of the decadence of nations.

When, to the rigors of a pitiless nature, were added the miseries of Moslem domination, and the perils of aggressive wars on the part of European neighbors, it is easy to understand what vast proportions this sentiment of individual abnegation acquired, and how it disposed the people, not only to submit to the despotism of the Mirs, (village assemblies of self-government,) and to the patriarchal discipline of the family, as it existed until recent years, but also to accept, nay to create an official autocracy, or State despotism strong enough to deliver them from the Moslem yoke, and from the Poles and Swedes; capable, too, of gathering together the fragments of national existence, and cementing the foundations of a great Empire.

Thus we see that the autocrats are truly the mandataries of the people, and the powerful progressive Russian Empire of to-day, bears testimony to the fidelity with which they accomplished their mandate.

Autocracy, therefore, is by no means the anomalous tyranny that it is misrepresented to be. It is essentially a popular government. I do not mean a government in which "every man has his say," according to Mark Twain's definition; I use the word popular in its general acceptance. And, we must also bear in

mind, that when the direct line of Rurick became extinct, Prince Michael, the founder of the present House of Romanoff, was, literally, called to the throne by popular acclamation, on the market place.

When political agitators devise a scheme for overturning existing institutions, and establishing a new form of government, their idea or concept, is, so to say, submitted to the vote of the people. If it is blackballed by them, the agitation is called a rebellion and the agitators pay the penalty. If, on the contrary, the idea, or concept obtains the consensus of the people, the agitation rises to the dignity of a revolution, and the agitators become the rulers. In 1825, in 1848, and in 1881, the idea of would-be revolutionists was submitted for popular approval, and was most decidedly blackballed.

It is generally conceded that if a plebiscite were taken to-day, two-thirds of the people would vote for the Czar. The rural millions are, according to Mr. Dragamonof, (Stepniak) too besotted to be roused into rebellion. "What can you do with a people whose greatest preoccupation is whether the sign of the cross should be made with three fingers or with two?"—he exclaims with disgust; while elsewhere he writes: "Our writers and publicists are too lacking in political training to make the attempt to re-organize our political régime." (P. 3736, Russia under the Czars.)

Now, be the cause stupidity or whatever it may, the Radicals and Nihilists of Russia, by their own admission, have never succeeded in gaining the adhesion of the people, and until they do so, I maintain that Autocracy is a popular government in Russia.

It may not be to the taste of Mr. George Kennan nor to that of Mr. Dragamonof and other members of the "intelligencia," as that class is called to which cultured perturbators of the peace like him belong. But governments exist for the masses and should be adapted to the requirements of the great majority of the nation, and not to the liking of these distinguished individuals, who are, no doubt, a law unto themselves.

Not only is autocracy a popular government, but it is also the government the best suited to the actual needs of the people, with their inherent race qualities, and in conditions which have been induced by uncontrollable antecedents. Freely then, do I bear my share of Mr. Dragamonof's contempt for "the blindness of certain writers, who contend that Russia is still unfitted to be her own mistress." (P. 333, Russia under the Czars "Stepniak.")

If, what are commonly called political liberties, developed so rapidly in England, it was probably due in a great measure, to more facile physical conditions, and to comparative immunity from foreign aggression, which their insular position afforded. And even with these advantages, how many centuries elapsed before the complete affranchisement of the nation was effected? The able historian of "The English People," (Greene,) repudiates this theory, which is, perhaps, somewhat fatalistic; but there may be a medium between according too much to physical environment and wholly denying its importance, as a factor, in the formation and development of national institutions, history and character.

CHAPTER V.

SERFDOM.

Delivered from a foreign yoke, reconstituted as a nation, endowed with some of the inventions of modern progress, Russia began to occupy a position by no means inferior, among the nations of Europe. But her progress was soon brought to a stand still again; this time, by internal causes.

Feodor, son of Ivan the Terrible, was incompetent, and his brother-in-law, Boris Godonof, ruled during his life-time, and, at his death, (usurped the throne, after having assassinated the rightful heir.)?

In 1593, Boris, by a stroke of his pen, decreed the thralldom of the masses, though it is probable that he did not himself foresee the extent of the evils he was entailing on Russia. Some writers say he was forced to take this measure, in order to prevent the emigration, en masse, of the peasants, to the newly conquered fertile Provinces of the South, as it was depopulating the environs of Moscow. There may be some truth in this statement, but there is no doubt that he was also actuated by motives of self-interest, and sought to fortify himself on the throne he had usurped, by ingratiating himself with the landed proprietors, who were then the mainstay of the army, and to whom this measure was very acceptable. Serfdom in some form is as old as the world, and it persisted in Europe long

after the introduction of Christianity. Monastic institutions which spread so rapidly during the Middle Ages, were but a form of serfdom, ennobled by religion ; a means of enchaining the human will without degrading the individual. The inhabitants of these monasteries—and their number was legion—could neither inherit nor bequeath, and, as regards the exercise of any of the functions of a citizen, their condition was exactly the same as that of the serf. This system of “civil death,” as it was called, was abolished by the French revolution of 1799. But serfdom had ceased in France and in England, with the decline of the Feudal System. In Prussia it was not abolished until 1835 ; and it will be remembered that the Elector of Hesse Cassel sold many of his serfs to England, to reinforce her armies during the American war of Independence.

The ancient Russian legislature recognized two classes of domestics. Firstly, domestics or serfs by contract, who sold themselves to a master for a term of years, or for his life-time. Secondly, complete domestics or serfs. The latter class was composed exclusively of prisoners of war. Even these could not be sold if they were Christians, and domestics or serfs of both classes became free at the death of the master. The fatal law of Boris did not, however, constitute slavery as it existed in 1860. It only reduced the peasants to the condition of the “*glebæ adscripti*” of the Feudal System. They and their descendants were chained to the soil, on which they happened to be at the time of the promulgation of the decree. The practice of buying and selling slaves individually, was an

abuse which established itself imperceptibly. The law of 1593 expressly forbidding the selling or even the bequeathing of peasants, without the land, or of the land without the peasants. For a long time evaders of the law took the precaution of selling an acre or two of land with the peasant ; but, in the course of time, even this precaution became unnecessary, and men and women were advertised for sale like animals and chattels.

At the beginning of his reign, Alexander I, received a petition from a number of serfs who had been sold to a Scotchman, and were cruelly ill-used at his foundations at Saint Petersburg. Only nobles were supposed to hold serfs, and this man had received a title, in recompense of the services he had rendered, by the introduction of steam navigation. The Czar sent the petition to the Council of State to have the matter examined, adding a few lines in his own writing to express his surprise that peasants had been sold in this illegal way. "I am sure," said his Imperial majesty, "that the sale of serfs without the land, is forbidden by the law." And the Czar, says Turguenef, the Senator, (not the novelist,) "was convinced that these "abuses were abolished, whereas they were becoming "more flagrant from day to day. At the Palace of "Justice, not two steps from the Imperial residence, "serfs were being sold to the highest bidder, at bankrupt sales." So utterly ignorant are autocrats of what is going on around them.

From the beginning of Alexander the First's reign, one million rubles of the public revenue were devoted annually to the purchase of lands to which serfs were

attached, while many nobles offered to liberate theirs without compensation of any kind; and though the Ukase of Emancipation was delayed until 1860, Russia was not the last stronghold of slavery among Christian nations. A peculiar feature of serfdom in Russia was, that none but Russian Slavs could be reduced to this unhappy condition. Even Tartars, who furnished large contingents to the army, were exempt from the law of Boris, and slaves of any other nationality became free on touching Russian soil. Pouchkine, one of Russia's greatest poets in the last century, was the grandson of an African slave, on whom it had pleased Peter the Great to confer a title and marry to a grand dame of his court.

At the time of the Emancipation there were two classes of serfs. Serfs à l'obrok and serfs à la corvée. The condition of the former was really not a painful one, when they belonged to wealthy and kindly disposed nobles. They paid their owner a certain redemption or rent, and were free to employ their time and make money as they chose. Thirty years ago most of the masons and carpenters of St. Petersburg and Moscow were serfs of this class, who had come from the provinces. Turguenef speaks of one of these serfs, who had made a large fortune as a hatter, and offered his master 800,000 rubles as the price of his freedom; the latter was in need of ready money and gladly accepted the offer. Others engaged in commerce and became quite wealthy. Their chain was long and light, but they were not the less slaves. In many respects their condition was similar to that of married women in England until recent years. They

could do nothing except in their masters name, and he could appropriate all their earnings if he chose to do so. This cruel injustice was sometimes perpetrated, but it was, happily, the exception not the rule. Before the Emancipation there used to be at St. Petersburg and the principal cities, agencies which supplied commercial houses and private individuals with cashiers, clerks and superintendents. Agents and employés were all serfs à l'obrok, and equally renowned for their great probity and capacity.

The condition of serfs à la corvée was by no means as favorable. They were forced to work for their masters at least three days in the week, and many rapacious owners were in the habit of exacting extra labor, as well as a tribute in the way of eggs, butter and honey. These unfortunate serfs were subjected to much ill treatment and injustice. They were often hired out to contractors of public works, scantily fed, and forced to work hard every day of the week, without remuneration. However, the crying wrongs of the serfs, like the cruel treatment of political exiles, have been dwelt upon so extensively, that it would be useless to expatiate here upon what cannot be too much vituperated.

"Most foreigners," says Mackenzie Wallace, "are already only too ready to exaggerate the oppression and cruelty to which serfdom gave rise, so that in quoting a number of striking examples, I shall only be pandering to a taste for the horrible and the sensational which is in no need of stimulus," The same writer informs us that in the year which preceded the Emancipation, the number of estates, placed under

curators, in consequence of the abuse of authority on the part of the owners, amounted to two hundred and fifteen.

On the other hand, when the proprietors were enlightened and humane, as was often the case, the life of the Russian serf "was much easier than that of many free men, who live in a state of complete individual freedom and unrestrained competition. And, when I say that the condition of many free men is worse than was the condition of many Russian serfs, the reader must not imagine that I am thinking of some barbarous tribe, among whom freedom means an utter absence of law and unrestricted right of pillage. On the contrary, I am thinking of a class of men who have the good fortune to live under the beneficent protection of English law, not in some distant inhospitable colony, but between St. George's Channel and the North Sea." (Wallace's Russia.)

So extreme a statement could only be made on the authority of a man who passed six years in Russia with the express purpose of studying the national institutions.

Since the beginning of this century all parties, the autocrats and the slavophiles, as well as the liberals and the radicals, deeply felt the necessity of abolishing a system which was opposed to all moral and material progress of individuals as well as of the nation, and must be overthrown before any other reforms could be effected. For the first time public opinion asserted itself in Russia. Poetry, romance and the drama prepared the way. Madam Markevitch was the serfs

Harriett Beecher Stowe, while "Dead Souls of Gogol" and Turguenef's "Memoirs of a Hunter," awoke public interest by presenting most faithful pictures of the lives of the serfs and their masters.

The Emancipation was accomplished by the united efforts of all classes, if we except the class, the most interested. To use the expression employed by Alexander II in his manifesto, announcing the termination of the Crimean war, and his projected reforms, it was truly the result "of the combined efforts of the government and the people," and in this respect it differs entirely from the reforms effected by Peter the Great without the nation, and in spite of it. The Emancipation considered in this light, marks a new era in Russian history, and shows the progress made by the nation during the last two centuries.

The great difficulty, lay in devising a means of conciliating the rights of proprietors with the liberation of their serfs, and of emancipating so large a body of inhabitants, without introducing the two devouring evils of Western Europe—pauperism and proletariat, hitherto unknown in Russia.

The method adopted was this. Half the arable land was taken from the serf owners, and given to the Mirs or Village Communes, who held it in trust for the emancipated serfs, to whom they portioned it out, according to the needs of each family. The dues on these lands were liberally estimated, and capitalized at six per cent. the government immediately paying to the proprietors four-fifths of the whole sum, by bonds or otherwise. The peasants were to pay six per cent. to the government, during forty-nine years, for the sums

advanced, and the remaining fifth to the proprietors, either at once or by instalments.

Strange as it may seem, the peasants were by no means overjoyed. Freedom in these conditions hardly appeared a boon. The brain of the moujik, is, as a rule, quite impervious to the meaning of the word liberty in the abstract; to him, the jargon of liberalism is an unknown tongue. "What has this Frenchman been jabbering about?" is all the response a revolutionary propagandist elicits from his moujik audience (Turguenef's Virgin soil.) This is the stone wall against which the hopes of radicals and nihilists have always been shattered. They forget that the people of whom they are the self-constituted champions against the autocrats, are absorbed by their physical necessities, and quite unconscious of the needs and aspirations which are attributed to them. "Russian radicalism is founded on the ignorance of the nature and the needs of the people, whose wants are reduced to such a minimum, that only extreme misery can rouse them to revolt, and very meager concessions suffice to appease them. Nor will this change, until the people have attained a certain degree of culture." (Fragment of a memoir found in the possession of a propagandist named Tsvilinef.)

What the Russian peasant does want, is to have the necessities of life, and this, as easily as possible. When, therefore, they understood that the ukase of emancipation left them hampered with the burden of obligations, as onerous as before, their first feeling was one of discontent. So much the more so, that they had never considered themselves exactly as serfs, and that

there was, among them, a traditional belief that the land belonged to the Commune, the nobles being only temporary occupants, with a delegated authority, who were allowed by the Czar, to exact labor and dues within certain limits. It was this feeling of proprietorship, no doubt, that preserved the moujik from the debasing influence of slavery, and maintained the simple dignity and self-respect which has always characterized these poor sons of toil. The ancient feudal tenure was probably at the root of this belief, which persisted, long after the former had become absolute ownership. "We are yours but the land is ours," was a popular saying among the serfs. So genuine was this conviction, that at the time of the emancipation a large commune in a province of Moscow naively sent a deputation to their former proprietor, to inform him that "as he had always been a "good master, the Mir would allow him to retain his "house and garden during his life time." And in recent years, when a general re-distribution of the land was confidently expected by the peasants, they kindly sought to reassure landlords who had large families, by telling them, "that they had nothing to fear, because, at the coming redistribution, they would certainly receive an extra piece of land in addition to what they already held."

The number of serfs emancipated in 1861, if we include the crown peasants and the domestic serfs, was about forty millions. The latter were not an agricultural class, and they received no lands, but generally continued to serve their former owners or new masters for wages.

Discontented, idle members of this class congregate in large towns, and may, in time, become a disturbing proletariat, open to revolutionary seduction. In the fertile districts, where land is always increasing in value, both peasants and their *ci-devant* proprietors congratulate themselves on their changed relations. Such is not the case, however, in less favored districts, where peasants and nobles alike find their well-being diminished by the emancipation.

From a moral standpoint, the reform was, for the nobles, a most undoubted and immediate benefit. They were deprived of the exercise of "power without right," of which Chatham truly says: "that it is the most detestable object which can be presented to the human imagination; it is not only pernicious to those whom it subjects, but works its own destruction." Moreover, the nobles were forced to shake off some of their oriental lethargy, and take means to adapt themselves to the new state of affairs, which, in many cases, diminished their revenues, and, always, made them more precarious and dependent on their own exertions. "Formerly," said one of them, "we kept no accounts and drank champagne, now, we keep accounts and drink beer."

Indirectly, the emancipation did ruin some nobles: those whose position was like that of insolvent merchants, who postpone the day of reckoning by means of credit and promissory notes; and those who continued to live recklessly beyond their income, without taking any means to adapt themselves to the new régime, were inevitably ruined, ere long.

For the peasants, the benefits of the emancipation

were less tangible; for them, the seamy side was at first the most apparent. In the days of serfdom, they grazed their cattle on the pastures of their owners, and they used his timber for building and repairing their izbas, now they are forced to rent pasturage, and must buy every piece of wood they need. If they were improvident or unlucky, the master was their resource; overtaken by sickness or old age, he was their providence. All this they naturally regret.

The emancipation has improved their legal position, and undoubtedly increased their opportunities of moral and material progress. Have they availed themselves to the utmost of their new advantages? Hardly. Their present condition, as compared with the past, is correctly described by a peasant's answer to inquiries on the subject: "How shall I tell you?" he replied; "it is both better and worse." *Better* for those whom industry, ability and favorable circumstances have enabled to profit by their liberty, to build up a little fortune, and become village plutocrats or "Koulaks," as they are called; *worse* for those whom improvidence, idleness or ill luck has reduced to the condition of wage-workers; whom penury has compelled to mortgage their time and labor. The burden of taxes is heavy, no doubt, though it has been somewhat diminished in recent years. But even admitting with the Nihilist "Stepniak," that "the peasant gives" up in taxes of all descriptions forty-five per cent. of "his income, or, in other terms, three days work in a week," it is hardly fair to make the agrarian conditions of the Ukase of 1860 wholly responsible for the misfortune of those peasants, who have fallen into

"kabala," or state of dependency of the laborer on his employer, which arises from the former's irretrievable indebtedness." For, at the outset, all were equally handicapped by the burden of taxes; those who succeeded in building up small fortunes, as well as those who fell into "kabala," which, after all, is really the condition of the masses of wage workers in all civilized countries.

"Arbiters of the peace," as they were called, who undertook the difficult task of conciliating the interests of the nobles and the serfs, acquitted themselves of their arduous duties with great skill and devoted disinterestedness, and the disappointed peasants were finally persuaded into appreciating their liberty, in spite of the onerous conditions by which it was accompanied. As much praise cannot be bestowed on the peasant judges. The elders of the Mir or village self-government, are afflicted with the prevalent malady venality, in all its forms. They sell their integrity for vodka (whiskey) and tamper with the funds that pass through their hands. Well-to-do honest peasants will not hold office, and in consequence the government of the village democracies often falls into the most unworthy hands.

The supineness and inebriety of the Russian peasants continue to be unfortunate facts, though they are often exaggerated. Their dishonesty, too, is proverbial, but it must be remembered that centuries of serfdom which impeded the development of civil and moral personality, also blunted the sense of personal responsibility. For generations they had been accustomed to supply themselves from their master's posses-

sions, and they could not instantaneously acquire a moral sense, in harmony with their new social status. They are not, however, devoid of good qualities and are often possessed of great mental resources. Even in the days of servitude, many showed themselves faithfully devoted, nobly disinterested, and, at the same time, endowed with remarkable acuteness.

Speaking of a serf who had been sent to Saint Petersburg to watch over his master's interests, in a case which was passing through the courts there, Turguenef says, he was struck by the great ability and technical knowledge with which this illiterate peasant pleaded his owner's case, while he, himself, was uncomplainingly enduring the privation of the necessities of life. "My master is poor and cannot afford to do more," he said, apologetically, when Turguenef alluded to his privations, and offered him pecuniary aid, which he accepted with simplicity and dignity. (*La Russie et les Russes.*)

Great revolutions can never be accomplished without more or less destroying the political equilibrium of a nation. Contending rights and conflicting interests must for a time, disturb the social organism and raise serious doubts, as to whether the remedy is not worse than the evil. Hence the device of conservators: "*Quieta non movere.*"

The magnitude and importance of the revolution accomplished in Russia, by the abolition of serfdom, as it existed in 1861, is not, perhaps, duly estimated. The very foundations on which the social structure reposed, were shaken, and a new legislation, so to say, became necessary to regulate the condition of these

millions who had had no legal existence hitherto. All this has necessarily induced what geologists would call a prolongation of the "liquid state," and many years must elapse before the nation can be consolidated on a new basis.

The absence of middle classes has been a long felt want in Russia, and it was intensified by the law of Boris Godonof, which isolated and nullified a large portion of the nation, who vegetated for centuries in the shadow of their rural institutions. More than one Russian sovereign has recognized the need of having a middle class of traders and artisans, and has sought to create one. Ivan, the Terrible, destructor of the commonwealths of Novgorod and Pskof, endeavored to raise and aggrandize the citizens of Moscow in particular, with a view to forming an influential urban class, as a counterpoise to the proud Kinaz, (Princes) and boyars (landed gentry.) Peter the Great pursued the same policy, and endowed the cities with many privileges, even according them a certain local autonomy.

Unfortunately the restriction of these privileges by his successors, and the transforming of several branches of commerce into State monopolies, retarded the formation of a bourgeoisie.

Catherine II, strove in vain to complete the work of Peter the Great, by dividing the traders and merchants into groups or guilds, having their own administration and privileges.

To Alexander Second was reserved the glory of removing the great obstacle, to the formation of a class of intelligent, responsible workers, capable of becom-

ing some day the co-operators of the Czar. This class is in process of formation, but these millions of ci-devant serfs are not yet sufficiently developed to become the guardians of political liberty, and the controllers of the bureaucrats. Like the giant Illya of Mouron, in the Russian legends, the people of whom he is supposed to be a personification, have been so long shackled and manacled, that even now, when the fetters have been forged off, they have not the full consciousness of their power, nor the free use of their latent faculties. Until they acquire both, autocracy and bureaucracy must needs reign, if the masses are to be saved from the tyranny of the learned proletariat, and of what Horace Greely calls "swashy politicians."

The cordial relations which continue to exist, between the ci-devant serfs and the nobles, are worthy of remark. At the Zemstvos or provincial assemblies of self-government, they deliberate side by side, without the least animosity or systematic opposition. Still it takes time for the serf to forget his former state, and for the owner to forget that these men who now speak of their rights and maintain them, were once his property.

Since the emancipation, the social dualism has been greatly attenuated, but not until it has been entirely destroyed, and the different classes linked together in common efforts for the common weal, will Russia show to the world, the whole gamut of her genius and strength.

If for individuals, adversity is the best training school for greatness, can the rude discipline which the Russian people have undergone, be unavailing for

their future grandeur? Even now, it is the Spartan stoicism, the unlimited obedience and patient self-abnegation of the peasant soldier, that make the force of the Russian army, while his mansuetude and bonhomie are the organs of Russia's genius for colonization and assimilation.

The conquered find the yoke less galling and soon become reconciled to it, when their yoke fellows of the conquering race are not overbearing, supercilious and arrogant. Like many a partial, discriminating mother, Russia will, no doubt, some day find that the children whom she has the most ill-used and neglected, are those to whom she will owe the most.

Revolutionary propagandists are not wanting, who endeavor to persuade the people and the public, that the condition of the peasants is worse than it was in the days of serfdom, and that soon they will fall into a state more deplorable than that of the "English people, whom the rich have deprived of their lands and reduced to the state of slaves." But they find the peasants quite inaccessible. Some writers are pleased to attribute their want of responsiveness to these incendiary efforts to brutish stolidity and rank inanity.

"What can you do," they say, with people whose greatest pre-occupation is whether the sign of the cross ought to be made with three fingers or with two?" (Stepniak.)

In reality, however, it is the filial devotion of the people to the Czar that is their best preservative. To rouse these apparently inert masses, it is necessary to appeal to them in his name. We have seen this done

very successfully in the massacre of the Jews. They were so persuaded in the latter instance that they were obeying the Czar, that in a certain village the peasants naively requested the permission of the government authorities, to leave certain houses unpillaged till the next morning. The only way to disabuse their mind in such cases, is for the troops to fire on them, and this means has been resorted to on more than one occasion, to convince them that they were not acting in conformity with the Czar's wishes. They have unbounded confidence in his omnipotent beneficence, and have lived, since the emancipation, in constant expectation of a new Ukase, which is to give them full possession of their lands, and better their condition in every way.

Their dreams would probably have been realized to a great extent, if the unfortunate Bulgarian war had not drained the public coffers and rendered fiscal reforms impossible for the time being. However, recent reforms in the system of taxation have somewhat ameliorated their condition, and, above all, the peasants are now free to indulge their love of roving. Strange as it may seem the land in many districts is quite unequal to the support of the rapidly increasing population. Not only does the supply of food not increase in the same ratio as the population, which Malthus affirms to be always the case, but the productiveness of the soil decreases, absolutely as well as relatively, owing to the impoverishment of the land by unscientific farming on the one hand, and on the other to the accelerated rapidity with which the population has multiplied of late years. In 1877 the cen-

sus numbered about seventy-eight millions, to-day there are nearly a hundred and ten millions.

Fortunately for Russia the remedy is within reach. The peasants are free to indulge their innate love of wandering, which provoked the measure taken by Boris in 1593. The Perm railway has been fully occupied of late in running emigrant trains across the Ural mountains. Sometimes in the course of a single year thirty to forty thousand peasants make their way to the fertile regions of Tomsk in Siberia; it is their promised land, "flowing with milk and honey." So much for the horrors of exile as they appear to the Russian mind. Formerly they used to tramp on foot two thousand miles to reach their destination, leaving many colonies and tomb-stones on the road like some of the aborigines of America. But the rapid development of the railway system has shortened these arduous journeys. Most of the peasants now tramp or ride as far as the Volga, sell off their cattle, proceed by steamer to Perm and take the train across the Urals to Tiumen, where the navigation system to Siberia begins. Thence they continue their journey to Tomsk by steamer. This form of tramp colonization, accomplished entirely by private initiative, existed long before the conquest of Siberia.

In military districts, at Kars or in the basin of the Amour for instance, the colonists are provided for by the government, they are transferred to their destination free of cost and find everything prepared to receive them when they arrive.

CHAPTER VI.

RUSSIAN CHARACTERISTICS.

Montesquieu, and other philosophers of history, have attributed undue importance to the influence of physical environments, and insisted in seeing in every social and political organization the logical sequence of certain climatic and topographical premises, as if these implied a fatality, from which there were no escape. Apart from the exaggerations of this school, the fact remains, that geographical and geological conformation, as well as latitude and longitude are important factors in the development of the character and history of nations, subjected to their influence for centuries.

Speaking of the effect of their surroundings on the ancestors of the English, Taine remarks: "Rain, wind and surge leave room for naught but gloomy, melancholy thoughts. The very joy of the billows has in it an inexplicable restlessness and harshness," and it is to these influences that the eminent critic ascribes the melancholy note that rings through English literature in general.

Unfortunately for Russia's commercial development, it is not the foggy, moaning sea that affects the inhabitants. Indeed, for many centuries she had no access to it whatever, and even now, that she has fought her

way to the ocean in every available direction, her harbors, except in the Black Sea, are frozen during several months of the year. But an effect, similar to that described by Taine, is produced by those everlasting plains, which roll on monotonously from verst to verst, and made Madame de Staël say, that when she woke in the morning after a night's travel in Russia, it always appeared to her as if she were exactly at the same place as the night before. Anyone who has crossed the ocean will understand this.

Those clear-cut lines of lofty peaks, which constantly confront the mountaineer, nowhere meet the Russian's gaze to shape his aspirations towards something definite and elevated, while bracing his nerves to energetic and persevering action. No distinct horizons, no well characterized contours relieve the eye, in these vast plains, that nurture vague aspirations, erratic ideas, and long-suffering resignation, broken only by fits of violence and undefined longing.

Hence the vague melancholy, that is the keynote of the Slav nature, and this compassionate tenderness, sad as the song of a Moujik, which sighs through the writings of all typical Russian authors.

But this substratum of melancholy in the national character is by no means an unsurmountable evil, for, in spite of it, the Saxon has achieved marvels on land and sea, in every latitude.

The Slavs have a more serious enemy to contend with in the extremes of their climate. An over-exuberant nature is man's worst foe; and luxurious climates are by no means favorable to the development of a nation; the most desirable conditions being those where great

difficulties exist, together with available means for overcoming them.

The intense cold, the long boreal nights of the interminable winter, crush and sadden the spirit of the rural millions, whom it condemns to forced inactivity through the greater part of the year. At St. Petersburg, in latitude 63 north, the interval between sunrise and sunset is reduced, on certain days, to a minimum of five hours and forty-seven minutes, the sun rising about 9 A. M. and setting at 2.52 P. M.

The intense heat of summer is, perhaps, not less trying in its way. In the plains of Kirghiz, which correspond to the latitude of the centre of France, the thermometer which has remained frozen for weeks, sometimes bursts with the summer heat; and these transitions are accomplished, with an abruptness of which inhabitants of more temperate regions have no conception.

In the same latitude as Paris and even of Venice, some places situated north of the Caspian and of the Black Sea, have, in January, the temperature of Stockholm, and in July, that of the Madeira Islands. These unfortunate extremes of climate are attributable to her geographical conformation, Russia being only a vast plain over which the glacial blasts from the north and scorching south winds, sweep unmolested by any mountain chain. She is, moreover, beyond the tempering influences of the Gulf Stream, without which the British Isles and the Scandinavian Peninsula would be uninhabitable.

Barbarian hordes and invading armies have also found, in these vast plains, a treacherous ally; and from time immemorial, they have swept over them

as ruthlessly as Euroclydon and the Sirocco. The Tartars were at home in these plains, which seem to be a continuation of the Steppes of Asia; but when they penetrated into Moravia and Hungary, it was a new apprenticeship. Their cavalry rapidly diminished for want of pasturage, and they were unable to cope with the difficulties of marches through mountainous regions. Thus it was that Russia had the monopoly of this terrible scourge.

It has often been remarked that in mountainous regions men are bound to the soil, as it were, and suffer, when they are torn from it, from that mysterious malady called nostalgia. The plain, on the contrary, never holds her sons, and the ever receding horizon, like some will-o-the-wisp, seems to lure the wanderer to advance further and further. The roof tree has no significance for the Russian peasant; his log house burns so often that he cannot possibly be attached to it. Nor have the privations and hardships of the exile and the emigrant any terrors for one inured to all the evils of poverty and inclement skies.

"With the sign of the cross, his hatchet in his belt, and his boots slung over his shoulder, the Russian peasant will set out for the other extremity of Asia," (Rimbaud.) It was to restrain this propensity for wandering, that the law of Boris Godonof was promulgated. Before and since this law, discontented or ambitious peasants, runaway serfs, persecuted non-conformists, all wandered from their homes and peopled the frontier districts, particularly the sunny Ukraine, the romantic lands of Kosac life.

Like their climate, the character of the Russians

has great extremes, and is composed of traits that might well be supposed to exclude each other. Febrile energy often gives way to lifeless torpor; listless indifference suddenly becomes impetuous energy and vice versa. Optimism and pessimism, credulity and scepticism, realism and idealism, characterize the same individual, alternately and even simultaneously.

I was at one time intimately acquainted with a Russian Princess, Alexandrine Molostwoff, of Kasan, whose nature was a tissue of contradictions, and quite a study from its continual play of light and shade, which always reminded me of the glints we see on the dark waves of a storm tossed ocean. She had come to France to undergo a very dangerous operation, and the chances of her recovering or succumbing were about even. Nevertheless she took advantage of her sojourn to replenish her wardrobe with quite a number of toilettes, not the least *recherché* of which was a burial robe, as she fully realized that she might soon need one. And I have seen her examine and discuss the furbelows of all with equal interest, passing from grave to gay with undisturbed equanimity.

What Bryce says of Americans, in his admirable work on the American Commonwealth, applies equally to Russians. "They are a changeful people, not "fickle, but they have what chemists call low specific "heat; they grow warm suddenly and cool as suddenly. They are liable to swift and vehement outbursts of feeling, which rush like wild fire across the "country." Like the American, too, the Russian temperament craves for moral stimulants, and loves to run risks and take chances. Commercial and stock

speculation not yet offering sufficient scope to these propensities, gambling is extensively indulged in.

Common places about the "Russian Bear," have so long and so often been repeated, that there is a popular belief that Russians, of all classes, are more or less uncouth and inhuman, and altogether lacking in that politeness and polish for which the French and Spanish are renowned. Nothing can be more erroneous. I have often been struck by the exquisite politeness with which members of the same family treat each other, and I do not think that in any part of the world, women are treated with greater deference in their own families than they are in Russia.

It is quite a common practice among the upper classes of France and Spain, for a son to kiss a mother's hand before embracing her, but I never saw brothers greet their sisters in this way, except among Russians. As to the peasantry, travelers seem to agree in saying, that they are, perhaps, the most kind hearted, affable and courteous people in the world.

Some years ago De Custine said, "that in Russia the traveler of observant and independent mind was constantly confronted with the task of laboriously discerning two nations in a multitude. These two nations are Russia as she is, and Russia as she would like to appear to Europe." It would perhaps have been more correct to say, "Russia as she is and Russia as she is trying to become." To use a popular expression she "has left one bank and has not yet reached the other."

It may truly be said that Russia is a great, robust, overgrown, backward child, struggling with all the

difficulties and perturbations of the transition state from childhood to adolescence ; and in her case these difficulties are so much greater that her development has been stunted and abnormal.

At the beginning of this century, Tchadief, a pessimist patriot, expressed himself thus : "Solitary in the world we have neither given nor received. We have not added one idea to the treasury of humanity, we have in nowise aided in perfecting the human mind." And Turguenef indulges in this sarcasm against his well-loved country : "We have given nothing to the world but the Samovar, and it is even doubtful if the Samovar be our own invention."

No wonder then that it was generally asked of Russia, as of the despised province of Judea, that gave a Saviour to the world, "Can any good thing come out of Galilee?" Nay, it was trenchantly affirmed that "Russia was rotten before she was ripe." But while French philosophers thus summarily disposed of their destinies, the Russians were gathering up their latent forces and preparing to make a new departure in literature as well as in sociology. All is rudimentary inchoate and experimental, it is true, but even her enemies admit that the deficiencies and shortcomings are those of youth and inexperience, not of senility or valetudinarianism.

"Fifteen years ago," wrote Leroy Beaulieu (in 1882,) when I was going to Moscow for the first time, the proprietor of the *Revue des deux Mondes* said to me, "Go and see if Russia is not a rotten plank ?" "To-day, alas, he adds, the managers of the

Evropsy or the Rouskaia Mysl could repeat the same injunction to their editors en route for Paris."

Speaking of the wonderful city built on a number of marshy islands at the mouth of the Neva, which were chiefly inhabited by bears and wolves at the beginning of the seventeenth century, de Custine thus expressed himself fifty years ago: "St. Petersburg "with its magnificence and immensity, is a trophy "raised by the Russians to their future greatness. "Never since the building of Solomon's Temple, has "a nation's faith in its destinies, obtained anything so "marvelous from the earth." This confidence in the future destinies of the country certainly is strong among Russian patriots. Their firm conviction is that "they have a great mission to fulfil," and it is on their future greatness that national self-complacency dwells, rather than on their present status, to the evils of which, they are keenly alive.

It is a well established fact, that at the root of all achievements, is that undefined, underlying self-assurance, which is, itself, a pledge and a forerunner of success. When nations or individuals have lost faith in themselves, little is attempted, and still less accomplished. If they do not always succeed, even with this faith, it is certain that they never succeed without it. A celebrated general was once asked; "What is a battle gained?" He was at first at a loss to answer, then, after a few moments reflection, he replied. "A battle is won when it is believed to be won." It is not numerical force that turns the scales, it is the moral persuasion of victory that storms the citadel, captures the redout, scales the rampart. The battle of Bull Run,

during the American civil war, is a remarkable illustration of this truth. Both sides thinking they were beaten, became panic stricken and fled.

Philosophers of history have remarked that sovereigns, even autocrats, command safely and absolutely, only what is consonant with the genius and sympathies of the nation, or at least not opposed to them. Without eliciting a murmur, Peter the Great could transport thousands of his subjects to lay down their lives in the foundations of the city, which it pleased him to build on slimy morasses, and exercise many other acts of arbitrary power; but, when he ordered his subjects to shave their chins, and that their wives and daughters should lay aside their Eastern seclusion, he was attacking their national superstitions, and raised a tempest, which nearly submerged the house of Romanoff. The Russian people appear to be a great inert mass, mechanically heaving to and fro, according to the impulsion given by the supreme motor. But this is only an optical illusion. In her ice-bound rivers, when all vitality seems extinguished, the current of animated life, with all its phenomena, goes on uninterruptedly beneath; and so it is with the nation. It lives, thinks, feels, grows; but slowly, and obscurely, according to its Oriental nature, imperceptibly, latently so to speak, but verily.

The policy of aggrandisement which is generally attributed to the personal ambition of the Tzars, has the entire sympathy of the nation. The Turkish wars in particular, whatever may be affirmed to the contrary in England and in Germany, were essentially popular wars. Writers like Haxthausen, affirm that

“ young Russia dreams of a great Slavonic empire, of “the restoration of Byzantium, of the ancient Tzaragrad, “but these dreams have not penetrated among the people.” It is not the less true, however, that the sovereigns who were victorious against the Turks, have always been the most beloved and popular, no matter how cruel and oppressive. When Ivan the Terrible, whose cruelty was certainly unsurpassed, threatened to abdicate, his subjects retained him by entreaties and supplications, for they remembered only that he had destroyed the last vestiges of Tartar domination. An instinct, like that which urged Attila and successive generations of barbarians to march upon Rome, still animates the Russians with regard to Constantinople. Centuries of oppression, have, moreover, caused an undying animosity towards the Turk, and created a powerful bond of sympathy which unites all Slavs, who have been subjected to Moslem domination. This sentiment of solidarity was the soul of the Bulgarian war, in 1877, and transformed simple, stolid peasants into heroic crusaders, who laid down their lives with joy to rescue their oppressed brethren from the tyranny of the Turks. “ When disturbances “ break out in the East, the Russian peasantry begin “ to think the time has come, when a crusade will be “ undertaken for the recovery of the Holy City on “ the Bosphorus, and for the liberation of their brethren in the faith, who now groan under Turkish “ bondage. This, says Wallace, is the religious element in that strange, attractive force, which connects Russia with Constantinople.”

Alexander the Second's doom was sealed, when, at

the conference of Berlin, he allowed German influence to preponderate by the candidature of Prince Alexander of Battenberg. The nation did not forgive him for frustrating them in their aspirations, and rendering void the many sacrifices they had made on behalf of their brother Slavs. It was their resentment of the Tzar's disloyalty towards them, more than his irresolute policy, that gave new strength to the machinations of Nihilism, which culminated in the assassination of the thirteenth March, 1881. No Tzar of Russia can, with impunity, neglect any opportunity of weakening and overthrowing the Osmanlis Turks. If he does so, it will be at the risk of his life or of his throne.

Whatever may be its disadvantages, Russia is, by no means tired of autocratic government.

Nothing can equal the devotion and the veneration of the people for the person of their ruler. Their worship has more of superstition in it than of slavish fear.

Everything belonging to him is sacred in their eyes. "Kayionne (property of the Tzar) does not drown in water, does not burn in fire," is a popular saying.

There is scarcely an instance on record of a collector of taxes being robbed, though these officers often traverse the country with large sums of money. When the collector entered a village he used to tap at the window calling Kerya, and the yearly tax was thrown into his bag. He did not need to verify the amount, and at night he could lay down his treasure, well assured, that the neighboring shrine was more likely to be despoiled than he.

No distinction is made between the will of God and the will of the Tzar. He and the Supreme Pontiff of Rome are the only sovereigns, who thus reign over the hearts and minds of their people. Yet no Russian sovereign has ever officially proclaimed himself head of the national Church as did Henry VIII.

It is governed by the Synod established by Peter the Great, when he abolished the patriarchat of Moscow, which Ivan III had instituted to replace that of Constantinople, when this city was taken by the Turks.

Such filial tenderness for their sovereign on the part of a nation governed as the Russians are, seems incomprehensible to foreigners. It would appear as though there were in the masses, an unconscious recognition, that it is not an individual despotism that oppresses them but the despotism of a system, itself the inevitable growth of unfortunate circumstances.

Though the Tzar seems to be the first Tchin of the empire, and so to say identified with the Tchinovism or bureaucracy, whom they hate, the Russian people, with the sure intuition of the unlettered, separate them entirely. For the Tzar they have the most filial veneration, while for the Tchinoviks they have the utmost contempt.

They make the same discrimination with regard to the clergy in their sacred character and the clergy as officials of the government.

It must be acknowledged, too, that whatever may have been the crimes and vices of some of the Russian rulers they have always been animated by the most sincere love of Russia. Absolute power and unlimited

adulation have never interfered with their earnest endeavor to promote her interests, to the best of their knowledge and ability. Indeed it is quite phenomenal, that mortals, sorely tempted as they are, should have retained so much humanity, and practised virtues, which would do honor to a private citizen.

When in 1711, Peter the Great was surrounded by the Turks at Yassy on the Pruth, with nothing before him but captivity or death, he wrote thus to the Senate at Moscow: "If I fall into the hands of the enemy, consider me no longer your sovereign, and obey no order that shall proceed from my place of confinement, though it should be signed by my own hand. If I perish, choose the worthiest among you to succeed me." Would not such perfect self-abnegation be considered sublime on the part of any military commander?

It was Peter the Great, too, who said to his son: "If you do not change your conduct, I will disinherit you. For my country and my subjects I have offered my life, and I will never refuse to lay it down; do you think, then, that I shall spare yours? I would rather have a stranger succeed me, if it were for the good of Russia, than my own blood, if it is good for nothing." And this same Czar, who ordered every member of the Strelitz or Imperial Body Guard to be put to death for traitorously conspiring with foreigners against their country, did not hesitate to risk his own life by plunging into the frozen Baltic to rescue a common soldier from drowning.

Peter the Great may truly be said to have *knouted* Russia into civilization, yet no one will deny that he, and even Ivan the Terrible, were fierce lovers of their

country. When the latter turned Novgorod into a great slaughter house, it was not to revenge a personal offense, as when Theodosius the Great destroyed Ephesus because his statue had been insulted there, but because the citizens of Novgorod were traitorously conspiring with the Poles and the Lithuanians in order to maintain their civic independence which Ivan deemed incompatible with national unity.

"After Russia I have loved you more than anything else in this world," said the dying Emperor Nicholas to his son, Alexander ; and every Czar could truly affirm, that Russia was always uppermost in his affections ; and, that according to his lights, he had always acted for the country's greatest good.

Towards the close of his long reign, Nicholas, broken hearted at the defeat of his troops in the Crimea, seems to have perceived that his policy was an anachronism, and detrimental to the country. "But I cannot change," he sighed ; "my son will do what he thinks right ;" and it is believed that he deliberately sought to remove an obstacle to his people's good, when he knowingly exposed himself to certain death. Though suffering from pneumonia, the Czar insisted on reviewing his troops at an appointed day in mid-winter. "Sire," said his physician, "no soldier would be allowed to stir out of the hospital in the condition you are in."

"You have done your duty," replied Nicholas ; "now let me do mine ;" and this great and good—much abused despot—returned home, a few hours later—to die !

I recommend to the thoughtful perusal of those for

whom the Czars are monsters, wallowing in luxury and vice, the following passage from Count von Moltke's "Letters from Russia." After minutely describing the magnificences of the Winter Palace at St. Petersburg, the great Prussian General writes :

" But, besides this, there is on the ground floor of the Palace, also on the northeast corner, a little vaulted room with one window, in which the mighty Emperor really lived ; he who ruled over one-tenth of the inhabitants of the earth ; he for whom Greeks, Catholics, and Protestant Christians, Mahometans, and Jews and heathen pray in four quarters of the globe, and on whose territory the sun never sets, and in some parts of which its does not rise in six months—here lived the man whom his people loved, whom Europe hated, because they feared him, but whom they were forced to respect ; whose personal appearance calmed the wildest insurrections ; at whose order, in the first cholera epidemic, the frantic multitude sunk upon their knees, begged pardon of God, and delivered up the ringleaders ; who, by his will, entangled Europe in a war which broke his heart. Here he died. His room has been left as the Emperor last saw it. Here is his little camp bed, with the same sheets, the coarse Persian shawl and the cloak with which he covered himself. All the little toilet articles, the books and maps of Sebastopol and Cronstadt—all lie unchanged—even the old torn slippers, which, I believe he wore 28 years, and always had mended. The Almanac which was set every day marks the day of his death."

Conjointly with their devotion to the Czar, Russians,

of all classes, are remarkable for their great respect for authority, their implicit obedience, and their keen sense of duty. It is an understood thing, in Russia, that personal merit confers higher rank than the mere accident of birth. The nobles are accustomed to see men from the lowest ranks take precedence of them, in virtue of services rendered to the State; and in these cases, the former obey unhesitatingly, and the latter command without the least consciousness of inferiority.

The word *Prikazeno* (it is ordered) always acts like a talisman. "What think you brother (every Russian peasant considers and call his fellow citizen a brother) shall we be able to take those fortifications," said a young recruit to his veteran comrade, a little before the siege of Warsaw.

"I think not, they are very strong," was the reply.

"Ay, but suppose we are ordered to take them, what then?"

"That is different, if we are commanded to take them, we will do so." And it was commanded and the fortifications were taken.

We may smile at the blind obedience of soldiers, continuing to water a parade ground when it had just been soaked by an unexpected shower, or at those, who in an accident on the Neva, having been ordered to rescue "chiefly the officers of the guard," enquired of every drowning man "are you an officer of the guard," before they tried to save him; But we cannot withhold our admiration, when we read of those who perished in the inundations of the Neva, rather than desert their post.

It is related that at the conflagration of the Winter Palace, a priest who rushed through the buildings to rescue the Pyx from the burning chapel, perceived, in one of the passages, a soldier enveloped in smoke. "Come away quickly or you are lost," cried the priest.

"No, said the soldier, this is my post, but give me your blessing"—the priest remonstrated in vain; he gave his blessing and barely escaped. The soldier was never seen again.

Who can measure the strength of a nation where a hundred and ten millions are pervaded by a spirit like this and animated by a most unlimited devotion to their chief?

Startling as the assertion may seem the Russians are sincerely and essentially democratic, and all the recent reforms have a democratic tendency.

The true Russia, that is, rural Russia, which comprises two-thirds of the Czar's subjects, is governed democratically, and nowhere in the world, do the rights of the "sovereign people" receive practical recognition as they do there. The autographobe "Stepniak" (Dragamonof) whose testimony on this point is unimpeachable, writes: "Up to the present time the law has allowed the Mirs a considerable amount of self government. They are free to manage all their economical concerns in common, the land, the forests, the census, the public houses, &c., they distribute among themselves as they choose the taxes. They elect the judges of the volost or district. The jurisdiction of the peasant tribunals is very extensive; all the civil and a good many of the criminal offenses in which one of the parties at least is a

“peasant of the district, is amenable to it. They are
“not bound to abide by the official code of law. They
“administer justice according to the customary laws
“and traditions of the local peasantry. The women
“are in all respects dealt with, on an equal footing
“with men. Labor, not kinship, is regarded as giving
“an indefeasible right to property. The Mir recogni-
“zes no restriction on its autonomy. It embraces all
“branches and domains of peasant life. With the
“Russian Mir the law is nowhere, the conscience
“everywhere. Not merely criminal offenses, but
“every disputed point is settled according to the in-
“dividual justice of the case, no recognition being
“paid to the category of crime to which it may be-
“long. The Mir recognizes no permanent law, res-
“tricting or guiding its decisions. It is the personifi-
“cation of the living law, speaking through the col-
“lective voice of the community.” (Russian peasantry,
p. 78 and following. Stepniak Harper Bros.)

In the foregoing description of rural self-govern-
ment, we find the great principles of equity, and of
judgment by one's peers, as well as the vexed question
of woman's rights, practically solved by the illiterate
peasants. If they did not devise something correspond-
ing to the *habeas corpus* act, it is probably owing to the
circumstance that imprisonment is an idea quite foreign
to the Russian mind. Exiling and flogging, which
are so shocking to our highly civilized ears, they
understand. Exiling, or transportation, to speak more
correctly, has always been practiced in Russia. Long
before Siberia was annexed, delinquents were sent
from one extremity of the empire to the other;

and until recent years it used to be the custom in the Caucasian district, for the prince to ride around the country administering justice in the most uncomplicated way. He listened to both sides, then administered a sound thrashing to the guilty party, who was forthwith dismissed.

The power of banishing undesirable members has always been considered so inalienable a right by the rural democracies, that the government could only deprive them of it indirectly, or rather place restrictions on its exercise. This has been done recently by obliging the Mirs themselves to furnish the money for transporting their banished ones, which was done hitherto by the Imperial treasury, thus greatly increasing the rolls of the governmental exiles, and giving rise to much uncalled for vituperation of autocratic despotism. It sometimes happens that as many as five thousand are banished by their fellow-citizens in the course of a single year.

With modern ideas of political liberty, the masses have no sympathy. The representative system in nowise appeals to them, and it is with difficulty that the peasants are persuaded to send delegates to the Zemstvos, or provincial assemblies. Popular government as it is practiced in the Mir, they understand and appreciate, while they cling to autocracy with every fibre of their being. In their mind, the autocrat is, according to the expression of Katkoff, "the guardian of the supreme authority, the living representative of the abstract idea of the fatherland." For them, the Czar and the "Mir" are equally infallible, and the decisions of the latter are always unanimous and never

appealed from, for, whenever the minority perceive that the general sentiment is against them they vote with the majority, and thus "the common sense of most doth hold a fitful realm in awe." Hence, too, the fatalism, the tyranny of the majority, and other defects always to be found in uncultured, impulsive democracies.

The hackneyed word Constitution is meaningless to the ordinary Russian mind.

After the death of Alexander I, the liberals fomented a military insurrection to place the Grand Duke Constantine on the throne, it was supposed to be a popular movement, but when vivats for the "Constitution" were shouted by the ringleaders, the naive inquiry as to "who this lady might be?" was heard on all sides. Many supposed that Constitucia must be the name of Grand Duke Constantine's wife.

"Remarkably flexible in the combination of labor, "and rich in resources in the higher domain of "thought, the Russian popular mind seems to have "been stricken with the curse of sterility in the domain of politics," laments Mr. Dragamonof, (*Russian Peasantry*, p. 375.) Thrice blessed curse! we might be tempted to exclaim, when we recall the corruption, the huckstering and the wire-pulling which have made politics and politicians a by-word and a reproach.

But if the Russians are fortunately or unfortunately devoid of political aptitude, the deficiency is marvelously compensated, by a remarkable promptitude and abnegation in times of emergency. In 1612 and in 1812, it was the people who saved the Empire in hours of imminent peril. The events of 1812, which will

be known in history as the Patriotic War, are familiar to all, and have been admirably described by Tolstoi in "War and Peace." Every one has heard how the people unhesitatingly burnt down their towns and villages on Napoleon's passage, and literally reduced the "grande armée" by starvation. "Just tell us when it is the right moment to do so, and we will set fire to our izbas," (log cabins,) said the peasants to the soldiers.

At Moscow, the governor, Rostopchine, fearing that the serfs might be seduced by Napoleon's proclamation, promising them freedom, placed 300,000 rubles in the hands of Glinka, the popular editor of the "Russian Messenger," to bribe their patriotism if need were. But it was quite unnecessary, and the sum was returned intact. The peasants armed themselves with pitchforks and hatchets, and did as much work as the soldiers.

No sooner was Napoleon established in the palace of the Tzars, than fires broke out in all parts of the city. Moscow, the "Holy Mother," was no more than a peasants "izba" when the country's safety was involved, and her citizens sacrificed her to the flames as unhesitatingly as the inhabitants of Leyden, in the Netherlands, opened the sluices and submerged the country in order to thwart their Spanish invaders.

The events of 1612 are, perhaps, less well known to foreigners, though not less honorable to the Russian people. After the death of Boris Godonof, there followed a time of anarchy and trouble, in which the newly equipped Russian state well nigh foundered.

In 1612, the elected Tzar, Choiski, and the Metro-

politan, were both prisoners at Warsaw; the Poles held the Kremlin of Moscow; the Swedes were at Novgorod, and the chief nobles were nearly all bought over by the enemy.

In this extremity the monks of the vast monastery of the Troïsta, sent letters to all the Russian cities, imploring aid for Moscow. When these letters were read at Nisni Novgorod, a butcher named Minime arose and harangued the people. "If we wish to save the Empire, he said, we must spare neither our persons, nor our families, nor our property."

The people rose en masse, armed themselves as best they could, and asked Prince Pojarski, the wounded patriot, to take their leadership. The improvised army marched against Moscow, besieged the Kremlin, and forced the Polish garrison to capitulate. King Sigismund came to the rescue of his troops, but it was too late, and he was forced to retreat. This was the last of foreign domination in Russia.

It was neither the Tzar, nor the aristocracy, nor the army that saved the country in this emergency. But for the energetic initiative and devotion of the common people, Russia must have become a Polish province in 1612.

Colossal statues of the butcher Minime and the Prince Pojarski, are to be seen to-day on the "Red Place" of Moscow; their descendants, the heroes of Borodino and Sebastapol, were so numerous that it would have been impossible to commemorate them all in the same way.

CHAPTER VII.

SLAVOPHILES AND OCCIDENTALS.

Peter the Great's draconic system of bringing Russia, *nolens volens*, into the pale of European civilization, gave rise to a protesting party which survived his reign, and whose tenets are still professed by conservative Slavophiles, equally opposed to Radicals and to Occidentals, or partizans of European importations in politics and literature.

Occidentals maintain that Russia is only one of the branches of the European tree, and that her growth has been stunted by an unnatural scission from the trunk. Consequently, they argue, there is no salvation for her, except in the transfusion of European sap. Slavophiles, on the contrary, maintain that Russia has in her traditions and primitive institutions more than enough to satisfy her present needs and cope with contingent difficulties; that all the failures and deficiencies of her organism are attributable to the introduction of foreign and heterogeneous elements. When the German element began to preponderate during the reigns of Elizabeth and Anne, and when the mania for everything foreign, French in particular, reached a climax under Catherine II, their hostility to all that was not Russian, in literature and in politics, became a veritable fanaticism.

The French Revolution, (1799,) the invasion of

Napoleon, (1812,) and the conspiracy of the Decembrists, (1825,) brought about a reaction in the public spirit which was a great triumph for the Slavophiles. They said to their compatriots what Saint Remi said to Clovis, first Christian King of the Franks, at his baptism: "Burn what thou hast adored, adore what thou hast burnt." And this the Russians proceeded to do with all the suddenness and the extremes which characterize the Slav nature. It was the inauguration of a new era for Russia, the dawning of her long-deferred day of Renaissance, the tardy awakening of the national genius. Russian literature, ideas, language and customs prevailed, and Occidentalism was held in suspicion, to say the least.

Patriotic Slavs loudly congratulated themselves on being Russians. "The nations of the West," they said, "began to live before us, and are consequently "more advanced, but we have nothing to envy; we "can profit by their errors, and avoid those deep-rooted evils from which they are suffering. We are "young and fresh. We have a great mission to fulfill. "Our name is already inscribed in the tablets of victory, and now we have to inscribe our name in the "history of the human mind. A higher kind of victory—the victory of science, art and faith—awaits "us on the ruins of tottering Europe." (Prince Odefski.)

Something must be pardoned to the ingenuous self-complacency of Slavophilism, in consideration of the services it has rendered. Under Slavophil impulsion, the national literature was saved from the condemnation of servile imitation. "*Imitatores servile pecus.*"

Horace could have cast this reproach in the face of nearly every Russian writer previous to 1825. Since then Russian literature has been emancipated from intellectual vassalage. With Gogol, Turguenef, Dostoïveski and Tolstoi in the vanguard, a truly national school of writers has arisen, who have surprised the world with the force of a genius which is only one of the secrets which the Northern Sphinx holds in reserve for future generations.

The veil of ignorance and indifference which enveloped the humble lives of the long suffering masses was removed. "Literature, said the Slavophiles, has "come to look at Russia with her own eyes; having "taken off her French gloves, she extends her hand to "the rude hard-working laborer." More than this, she became the advocate and the disciple of the poor oppressed toilers. So long ignored, despised, trodden upon, the humble peasants became the object of a veritable apotheosis and the staple subject in literature. Their qualities, customs, habits, and beliefs were discussed in prose and verse, and with marked partiality in general, though of course here as everywhere, the usual extremes were to be found.

The satirical humorist Saltikof, who was an uncompromising occidental, complained with disgust, "that the literature of the day was permeated with an odor of peasants."

He was one of those who had no faith in his country's native resources, and persisted in seeing in the emancipated serf only a "moujik" (a contemptuous diminutive for mouji man) who could never be anything but a kind of beast of burden as hitherto.

The Slavophiles tabooed, not only foreign literature but also foreign political innovations.

"Russia and the other nations of Europe have developed in circumstances in no wise analogous they argued, and her situation cannot therefore be ameliorated by measures, which have been so unsuccessful among the Western nations; while Karamsin undertook to prove, historically, that autocracy was the generating and conserving principle of Russia's greatness." This historian was one of the principal authors of the protocol that the Senate once presented to Alexander the First, and in which we read these words, "Why change our laws and usages, and from whence come these changes? From the very centers where reign revolutions and this license of thought and teaching, which, under pretext of developing the mind only rouse the passions."

Panslavism is a natural outcome of Slavophilism, though some Slavophiles of to-day who form what is called the "national party," deprecate all extension of territory by conquest or alliance; "Russia for the Russians," say these adepts of the Monroe doctrine. As the guardians of the national traditions, Slavophiles naturally maintain Russia's secular claim to Constantinople, founded on the marriage of Ivan the Great with Sophia (Maria) the rightful heiress of Constantine Dragases its last Greek emperor, and they dream of a great Slav confederation, of which the Tzar would of course have the hegemony. In 1876 Slav Committees fanned the public spirit into enthusiasm, and made the Bulgarian war a veritable crusade. They are said to have furnished three million rubles and over

four thousand volunteers for this cause. Even now they continue to subsidize churches and schools among the Slavs of the Balkans, and even among Slavs in the United States.

Besides the Slavophil and the occidental, there is a third school, which is somewhat nihilistic in its tendencies. It maintains that there is nothing worth preserving in any of the existing institutions, either Slav or Occidental and it believes in some new and special political revelation for Russia, under the inspiration of which, an entirely unique edifice will be raised. Perhaps there may be some latent truth in this theory. It is certain that Russia seems to labor under a two-fold difficulty, half Asiatic and half European, it would appear as though she could neither appropriate and successfully adapt European methods, nor rejuvenate her ancient institutions and create new ones in harmony with her present needs.

The Mir, a time-honored institution, whose origin loses itself in the shadows of Russian pre-historic times, and which has survived the deep inundations of more than one deluge, seems to have deteriorated and lost its efficacy for good. The Mir, which was the only rampart of the peasant's dignity, the last asylum of his self-respect in the days of serfdom, seems to have become an anomalous tyranny and an obstacle to the fusion of the emancipated serfs with the small landed proprietors with whom they are, legally, on an equal footing. The police is even obliged to interfere to defend the individual rights of the peasants, when the Mir abuses its powers, as it often does in recalling members of the village com-

munes, who are exercising lucrative trades in the city, in order to extort money from them above the usual village taxes.

Altogether the Mir has been a subject of disappointment with optimist patriots who were proud of it as being their only ancient-national institution. These rural democracies are essentially Slav, but they are not exclusively so. Landed communism which is their principal feature, existed among the Samoyds of the North, the Tehouvaks, in Java, India, Mexico, Peru and China. The Mirs are relics of an era long since gone by, like those intact insect forms found incrustated in amber on the Baltic coast, which owe their preservation to their isolation, and crumble away when exposed to exterior influences.

According to the terms of the Ukase of Emancipation, the peasants will, in twenty years hence, be entire proprietors of the lands for which they now pay a rental tax, and landed communism will then either cease altogether or become the basis of a legalized socialism. Whether the Mirs can be remodelled and continue to exist as auxiliaries of the Zemstvos or provincial assemblies of local self-government is still uncertain.

The Zemstvos or assemblies of local self-government established by Alexander the Second, are in some measure a revival in permanent form of the Zemski Sobor or assembly of the delegates of the nation, whom the rulers of Russia in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries summoned at critical moments. These assemblies were somewhat like the States General (*Trois Etats*) in France, convened for

the first time by Philipe le Bel against the Pope, and for the last time by Louis the Sixteenth, to conjure away the French revolution.

The Zemstvos of each province consists, (first) of an assembly of deputies chosen from among themselves by all classes, and meeting once a year; and, (second) of a permanent bureau elected by this assembly at its annual sessions and renewed every three years. In these assemblies rich merchants of the city, nobles, landed proprietors and moujiks, with their unkempt beards and sheep skins, elbow each other in a way which would be quite impracticable in any country where the distinction of classes is not as in Russia, purely nominal and superficial. The attributes and powers of the Zemstvos are still in a fluctuating, undefined condition. They regard generally all that concerns the material and moral well-being of the respective provinces, taxes, roads, bridges, sanitation, primary education are in their jurisdiction.

And it must be said to the glory of the Russian nation that the first use the provincial government made of the right of self-taxation was in favor of popular instruction. In the province of Viatka which has an almost exclusively peasant population, the Zemstvos, largely composed of moujiks, consecrated one-fifth of their resources to popular instruction. The central government seconded the efforts of the provinces by reducing the period of military service for peasants who could read and write, and the result was very satisfactory. In 1860 out of one hundred recruits only two could read, while in 1870 eleven per cent. was the average, and since then the ratio has steadily

increased. In the course of a single year (1879,) and immediately after the drain of the Bulgarian war, the State devoted sixteen million two hundred and thirty thousand rubles for the department of public instruction.

But still it must be admitted that the combined efforts of the central government and of the Zemstvos have not yet succeeded in so fully covering their vast territory with primary schools and colleges, that correspondents and travellers of the Saxon and Teutonic races cannot step in and lament over the deplorable absence of educational institutions in rural districts. "Rome was not built in a day," nor can a nation supplement the deficiencies of centuries in a score of years.

The Zemstvos may, at any moment of emergency, be transformed into an assembly of national self-government, and very little would be required to effect the metamorphosis. Every one knows and feels this, and the autocrats being human, are naturally a little susceptible, with regard to these institutions, which are probably the future organs of national autonomy.

They have sometimes shown their susceptibility, by reminding the Zemstvos that their administration is strictly confined to local interests, and that they have not even the right to concert together for the mutual benefit of contiguous provinces. Nevertheless, Alexander II and Alexander III, have, on more than one occasion, summoned members of different Zemstvos to confer with the Council of State at Saint Petersburg, or with some special commission, on subjects of grave interest for the whole country. These members.

were, it is true, only called "experts," and were chosen by the Tzar himself.

If they were chosen and deputed by the Zemstvos, with recognized authority, to discuss and legislate for their constituents, they would be neither more nor less than members of Congress and Senators, and Russia would have a representative government.

The Zemstvos, in spite of many defects and shortcomings, due to inexperience and other limitations, are favorably viewed by all parties in Russia; not only by Occidentals and Radicals, but also by Slavophiles, devoted to autocracy. The latter have no thought of diminishing the Czar's authority; on the contrary, they see in local self-government a means of placing themselves under his immediate control, without the hateful intermediary of the bureaucrats, whose mal-administration, they say, casts a slur on autocracy.

More autocracy and less bureaucracy is the general demand. The Slavophiles do not seem to realize that if neither the powers of the Zemstvos nor those of the throne are legally defined, a conflict between these two jurisdictions may arise, sooner or later.

In the meantime the nation is serving a much needed apprenticeship in the art of self-government, and the Zemstvos, will, most probably, be the basis of Russia's new political structure.

Since the accession of Alexander III, all parties are in a quiescent state, at least on the surface. The nation has given itself up to self-recollection and recuperation. Perhaps in this interval of silence and quiet, some new and eclectic system of government may be devised, in which "the wolf and the lamb shall lie

down together ;" autocracy and autonomy work hand in hand for the common weal. Russians have so many surprises and contradictions in their exuberant nature, that there seems no reason why they should not discover, in their untold resources, some secret alchemy, whereby these antithetic elements may be made to combine. Autocracy seems to be an unmitigated evil, utterly incompatible with modern liberties. Strychnine and arsenic, too, were considered, until recently, to be nothing but deadly poisons, yet modern science has converted them into most valuable agents for man's well-being.

Conceptions of freedom, that vaguest of words, are not exempt from the universal law of change: nor are they the same among all nations. To have the right to govern ourselves is, in general, the European's idea of liberty, while for Asiatics, and semi-Asiatic nations, liberty consists in a right to be governed. And Carlyle declares that "the everlasting privilege" "which fools have of being led by the wise, is one "of the first "rights of man."

How far should ignorant majorities be guided and governed by wise minorities? To what extent should society be protected against knaves, and fools protected against themselves? Shall the sharp-witted floater of fraudulent schemes, who overreaches and defrauds his unwary neighbors, while keeping within the law, be restrained by penal codes, as well as the brawny foot-pad who knocks down his puny fellow-citizen and filches his purse?

These are some of the knotty questions which confront the statesman in countries where every man is

left "to scramble for himself," and where the theory, "that the best government is the government that governs the least," has been amply tested. If these questions are not answered in some satisfactory manner, we may one day witness revolutions of a novel character. Nations revolting, not, as in former times, against tyrants, who govern too much, but against governments, that do not govern at all.

Experience has shown, that in the struggle of unlimited competition, fraudulent trusts and overpowering monopolies may be generated by the entire absence of State intervention. Even equality before the law may become a snare for the weak, for, when those who are not equals are treated as such, the weaker almost invariably succumbs to the stronger; the poorer to the richer. In a word, it is on the inferior that the burden of inequality falls.

Mr. Froude declares that, "in England swindling "has grown to a point where the political economist "preaches patience unsuccessfully—that government "will have to take up again its abandoned functions, "and will understand that the cause and meaning of "its existence is the discovery and the enforcement of "the elementary rules of right and wrong." (P. 276, Vol. II, Short Studies.) Even "the nation that has "practiced democracy most successfully is beginning "to find that the very freedom of association which "men sought to secure by law may, under the shelter "of the law, ripen into a new form of tyranny;" and "that after having shaken off the yoke of one, a "nation may fall beneath the yoke of a crushing "majority. The hand of the government is begin-

“ning to be invoked in America for many purposes
“of common utility, and with which government did
“not interfere.” (Bryce’s American Commonwealth.)

And yet in a co-operative age like ours, where everything of any magnitude must be accomplished by association, trusts and combinations and syndicates are not evils, necessarily. But it is more than ever incumbent on governments to accomplish their high mission, of giving full scope to collectivity while safeguarding the rights of individualism. The only question is, by what form of government can these conditions of ideal socialism be fulfilled. Anarchy cannot do it, *cela va sans dire*.

Every form of government supposes an authority supreme, and infallible, *de facto*, if not, *de jure*, from which there is no appeal. Whether this authority or sovereignty be vested in one man like the autocrat of all the Russias, or in two Houses of Parliament, or in a Supreme Court, does not alter the fact, that practical infallibility is a *sine qua non* of any, and every form of government. Now is there any valid reason why it is impossible for the rights of collectivity and of individualism to exist where the Supreme Tribunal is composed of one, or why they should be best secured, when it is composed of several?

Is not the Autocrat who has nothing to gain and nothing to lose, isolated on the apex of the social pyramid, as he is in Russia, quite as likely to be wise and impartial, as men, who, are not always clear sighted and inaccessible, because they have a passion or an ambition to gratify, whether it be a lofty or a sordid one matters little. I have not the presumption to prefer

one form of government to another. "Aristocrat, autocrat, democrat! What care I?" (Tennyson.) Organisms, whether political or social or physical, must not be judged subjectively, or in the abstract, but in view of the environment and conditions in which they exercise their functions: and the best form of government is the government that best succeeds in fulfilling the ends of government.

I only wish to suggest that autocracy is not, perhaps, wholly or necessarily incompatible with the highest forms of autonomy, with ideal socialism in other words, and, that in Slavophilism that clings to autocracy while pleading for autonomy, there may be more sanity and consistency, than appear on the surface.

The Russians, with their paternal government, to which they cling in spite of the railleries of the world, are not, perhaps, so very far from the charming Utopia which Mr. Ed. Bellamy has ingeniously conceived, and so admirably described to thousands of captivated readers. "Looking Backwards" was a cry from the author's heart, and such cries never fail to waken responsive echoes. Critics may cavil and pick holes in his system, and put in indignant pleas for the effaced dignity of individualism, but humanity believeth all things, hopeth all things, and hopes against hope that, somehow, the rough places will be made smooth and the appalling inequalities of life be evened up. Writers (I mean writers who are thinkers as well as writers), are always the seers of their generation, and more or less endowed with the soul of prophesy. And if Mr. Bellamy's Utopia of ideal socialism be some-

thing more than a beautiful wild dream, no country would furnish a more favorable field for the experiment than Russia. Communism and socialism have been practiced there for centuries, and the institution of a system, such as he describes, would have nothing shocking or preposterous to the bulk of the Russian population. There are no adamantine prejudices to be overcome there, no class privileges and traditions to be laid aside, and Russians, of all classes, from the Czar downward, are by instinct essentially and fundamentally democratic in spite of apparent barriers, distinctions and conventionalities.

Some day, perhaps, when the institutions of modern liberalism have been found wanting, and excess of freedom has proved destructive of freedom, the much maligned, condemned Russian Slavs may have a few suggestions to make to the world on the subject of national polity.

All the nations of Europe have had their share in the work of civilization, and played their part with with more or less distinction. Not so Russia. Her rôle in the past did not seem to be a more dignified one than that of the Ural Mountains. For many centuries, her only reason for existing, apparently, was to act as a barrier against Asiatic invasions, to be a kind of buffer State, providentially designed to preserve Europe from colliding with the barbarous Orient, and being again deluged by hordes like those who swept away the Roman civilization. Later on, Russia seemed a sort of watch dog, charged to worry the Turk and keep him at bay, lest he should again molest and invade Europe, as in the days of Charles Martel.

The history of Russia, hitherto, has only been the history of the Russian State, and the people have been, so to speak, the devoted votaries over whom this juggernaut has rolled in its progress from century to century. But now that Russia has lived down the past, now that she has conquered an unassailable position, and commands the respect and the consideration, even of her enemies, the immolation of these self-sacrificing millions is no longer needed, and it is time that they should reap the fruits of their long abnegation.

This was the inspiration to which was due the movement of "peasantism," to which I alluded at the beginning of this chapter, and of which the "going to the people" of the Nihilists, was only a spurious imitation. How the greatest good of these devoted masses can be best obtained, is a serious problem that has occupied Tzars and patriots since fifty years, and is still far from being solved.

One of the distinctive traits of nineteenth century, sociology and science, is the importance attached to minimum causes.

In physiology, says Melchior de Vogué, our century may be called the era of microbes, for scientists seem to see a "germ" in all the ills that flesh is heir to, and in political economy, it is the exaltation of the lowly, the *exaltavit humiles* of the Evangel.

The chronicler of the past recorded the lives and acts of great personages, who made war and peace, and changed the face of empires, *ad libitum*. But, to weave the warp of history, the writer of the future, will have to follow the threads of popular aspirations and movements. This new phase of human progress,

that disconcerts and alarms conservatives in religion and in politics, is, however, the inevitable result of the fermentation of the evangelical leaven, the last analysis of the Gospel preached to the poor and the lowly, nineteen centuries ago, and it is impossible to foresee to what transformations it may lead, not in Russia only, but all over the world.

The Nihilist chief, Bokounine, once said, that "it was the peasantry who carried the whole Russian Empire on their backs, and that the moment they found it out, down would come the whole concern." He, no doubt, sincerely hoped it might be so, but it is not equally sure that his prognostics will be realized.

It is true that the Russians have been, hitherto, only what circumstances have made them, and that ere long they will be themselves. But though poor theologians, and still poorer politicians, they are a nation of humble toilers, reared in the school of adversity, the best of training schools.

For centuries they have ingloriously and unconsciously practiced some of the fundamental virtues of Christianity, and if they are only left to themselves, they will peacefully unravel the difficulties which red-handed Nihilists are always trying to explode with dynamite.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE ROMANOFFS AND THE REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT.

After the death of Boris Godonof's son, the usurpation of Dimitri and the critical times to which allusion has been made, the Romanoffs, descended from Rurick by the female branch, were called to the throne, in the person of the young Prince, Michael, who was unanimously elected by the Zemski Sobor, or National Assembly. When his grandson, Peter the Great, began his eventful reign in 1682, the country, in spite of its recent initiation into European politics, was steadily drifting back into Oriental traditions, and would, ere long, have sunk into the non-progressive inertia of Eastern nations, if the new Czar had not sternly resolved that, in spite of all obstacles, Russia should henceforth be European and progressive. Though Peter the Great was unremitting in his labors for the improvement and aggrandisement of Russia, he was by no means a judicious legislator. He piled upon the nation a mass of incongruous laws and statutes, extracted almost verbatim from foreign codes, and which were of no real benefit to the country, owing to their multiplicity and inadaptability.

Nor were the hands to run the cumbersome governmental machine easily found. They, too, had to be imported. For Russia, it must be remembered, had, for centuries, been administered like a private rural es-

tate, the governors acting as farm intendants ; so that state craft and politics were almost occult sciences, and numbered few adepts.

Thus began the bureaucratic system *à l'allemand*, which was a fruitful source of evils, and placed the nation at variance with itself during more than two hundred years. For, the ponderous formalities of German bureaucracy are wholly alien and profoundly antipathetic to the rough and ready of the Slav nature, to which martial law and summary justice, or even injustice are far more comprehensible and congenial.

At first, only Peter the Great and his immediate followers abjured Orientalism and adopted Western ideas, customs, dress and language. Gradually, however, the provincial nobles and the official classes yielded to the impulsion given ; but the lower strata of the nation, including thirty or forty million serfs, utterly removed from foreign influences, remained profoundly Oriental, and for nearly two centuries Russia presented a singular spectacle of duality. A very small minority, among whom foreign customs, ideas and language prevailed, who were often foreigners themselves, presided over the destinies of the immense masses, of whose needs and desires they were wholly ignorant, and to whose well being they were supremely indifferent.

Since the consolidation of Muscovite autocracy, there have been no civil wars of any consequence in Russia, and as her foreign campaigns, even when unsuccessful, have always had a civilizing influence, short sighted people have concluded that, because certain

disastrous wars were followed by important reforms, these things must necessarily stand to each other in the relation of cause and effect. *Post hoc ergo*. But this is true, only, in so much that war brought into play factors that led to radical changes. Not the least important of these factors was the long forgotten sentiment of national brotherhood.

It may be said that the national fusion began on the battle field, in the struggle against the Corsican invader, Bonaparte. When thousands of nobles and peasants fell side by side at Borodino, Beresina and Moscow, (1812) in defence of their common fatherland, the dormant sentiment of national fraternity awoke; the injustice of the existing state of affairs appeared in all its revolting reality, and the indignation it aroused led to much needed reforms, to the emancipation of the serfs in particular.

As early as 1553, Ivan IV had introduced printing into Russia; but for many years to come there was not much to print. Writers were scarce, and readers were still more so. Existence itself was too precarious and laborious, for the people to have much time or interest to bestow upon intellectual culture. Even in the reign of Catherine II it was a general complaint that parents would not send their children to school. And primary education was not made obligatory in Russia, as has since been done in other countries. It was Peter the Great who established the first Academy of Science and Normal Schools in Russia. The Empress Elizabeth established preparatory schools, and at Moscow the first Russian University, where, as an incentive to students of the poorer classes, a certain

number were admitted gratis, and all who graduated were entitled to wear the sword, which was the distinctive badge of nobility.

After Peter the Great, the sovereigns who are specially entitled to be called Reformers are Catherine II and Alexander II.

Catherine was a disciple of Montesquieu, Jean Jaques Rosseau, Voltaire and the French philosophers in general. Her views were most liberal and tolerant, and her tastes artistic and literary. It is impossible to say what she might have accomplished, if the French Revolution (1789) had not caused a sudden veering in her liberal views and policy. Many of the reforms of Catherine were not of much more practical benefit than those of Peter the Great, but she accomplished an useful work when she organized the different provinces, with their respective municipalities. It was a preparatory step in the way of local self-government.

Catherine the Second established Communal Schools in all the chief towns, as well as Technical Schools in many places. In imitation of Madame de Maintenon's St. Cyr, she also endowed an Institution for the education of orphans of noble birth; and a little later her daughter-in-law, the mother of Alexander I, made similar establishments for the humbler ranks of society.

The first law schools, it must be said, were a complete failure. They had to be closed for want of students, as the Russians do not seem to have taken more kindly to law, than they have done to politics.

Alexander I (1801 to 1825) inaugurated a liberal policy at the beginning of his reign. He projected

the emancipation of the serfs and a constitutional government for Poland; but both these projects were unrealizable at the time, and many disappointments and disillusion darkened the latter part of his reign, rendering him somber, suspicious and despotic.

Since the reign of Catherine II the education of the upper classes had been confided entirely to foreigners, chiefly to the Jesuits, to whom the Czarina had given asylum when they were expelled from France, through the influence of the Duke de Choiseul and Madame de Pompadour over Louis XV. Foreign intercourse was facilitated and encouraged, the rich always sending their sons abroad to complete their education, as the national institutions were insufficient and incomplete. Even the government used to send many students to the German Universities, which then, even more than now, were hotbeds of Socialism, thus preparing for itself the eternal surprise of the hen that hatches a brood of goslings, when a generation of Nihilists cropped up some years later.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century there was a great penury of writers in Russia, and the Free Masons did their best to serve the cause of literature by establishing what was called a "Typographical Society." Every manuscript, prose, verse, translation or composition, was bought by this Society at so much a page, and quite irrespective of merit, so that no one should be discouraged, even if his pages did find their way into the fire very soon. The Masons also undertook the education of impecunious youths of literary promise. Karamsin, who may be called the father of Russian history, was one of their protégés.

The Lodges, however, were gradually becoming political centers. In 1815 they organized, in imitation of the German *Tungunbund*, a Society called the "Alliance of Beneficence." Here was fostered the Liberal Conspiracy of 1825, which was so rudely crushed. This first revolutionary movement differed from that of 1848, being entirely aristocratic, and led by Russian Lafayettes, Mirabeaus and Philip Egalités.

These well-intentioned political theorists wished to embellish their massive country with charters, constitutions and constitutions, *à la mode de Paris* and of London, without having first well ascertained if Russia were yet able, or would ever be able, to use them. "My greatest fault," said Pestel, one of the ringleaders of that insurrection, "was having tried to reap without having ploughed and sown."

With Nicholas I (1825 to 1855) Russia put on her iron mask, and wore it for many years. Every source seemed frozen, every current petrified. It was the reign of "Censorial Terror." No book, recent or ancient, Russian or foreign, could circulate without the visa of the Censor. "A dark cloud weighed over what was then called the 'administration of science and literature,'" said the critic Bielinski. "Every writer is a bear who ought to be kept in chains," was the maxim in vogue. History was taught somewhat in the spirit of the French professor, who informed his young public "That the Marquis de Bonaparte, Generalissimo of his Majesty Louis XVIII, entered Vienna in triumph," etc., and like the word "King," during the French "Reign of Terror," the word Liberty was interdicted and its employment considered

a treasonable offence. It was not even allowed to hint that Ivan the Terrible was a tyrant. There were but seven newspapers at this time, and they were reduced to entire nullity, being simple records of insignificant daily events.

Yet Nicholas was a sincere patriot, a liberal minded, cultivated gentleman in the highest sense of the word, and truly anxious to promote the national welfare. Unfortunately his theory was that this must be done without the co-operation of the people, and by removing them entirely from foreign contact. He surrounded them, therefore, with a sanitary cordon as it were, in order to preserve them from the contagion of Western Europe. The Czar Nicholas has been called the Quixote of autocracy, and indeed his whole reign was a hopeless struggle, at home and abroad, with the revolutionary spirit and the irrepressible elaborations of the human mind.

In spite of all his precautions, the imported germs of revolt were developing in secret. Under cover of metaphysical discussions, the students, who had been educated abroad, initiated their compatriots into the radicalism of Hegel, Proudhon, St. Simon, and others. Enigmatical commentaries of Feuerbach and Faust circulated unmolested by the Censors, while seditious novels, like those of Herzen and Saltikof, enjoyed the same immunity.

Emboldened by their success, Petrachevaky with other collaborators, who became victims of the conspiracy of 1848, which bears his name, devised a "Dictionary of foreign terms," in imitation of the Encyclopedia, by which Voltaire, Diderot, D'Alem-

bert, ("the Encyclopedists") propagated their subversive ideas and prepared the French Revolution.

The réunions of these conspirators had been frequented during two years, before they were tracked by the police to whom they were betrayed, by one of the members. It is generally supposed that the Russian police is Argus-eyed and Briareus armed, and that like Asmodeus, in *Gil Blas*, it is always plunging inquisitorial glances into the lives of inoffensive citizens, and troubling peaceful families with domiciliary visits. But, in reality, the number of those who are under its surveillance is relatively very small indeed; and as a body, this police is the most inefficient in the world. They are utterly wanting in the tact, acuteness and activity which distinguish the German and French police, and the growth of Nihilism was no doubt attributable to their incapacity, and even to their venal complicity in some cases. Bismarck always knew exactly where and when to strike the German Socialists and disconcert all their well laid schemes; but the Russian police are generally the last to discover a plot, and when they do so, it is often by some happy chance.

Some of these conspirators in 1848 were only followers of the Decembrists (of 1825), and sought nothing but constitutional reforms. Others were precocious Nihilists of the worst type, whose object was to demolish the whole social edifice, family property, throne, altar—nothing was to be left standing.

The expulsion of the House of Bourbon, (1848) whom Alexander the First and the allied sovereigns had reinstated on the throne of France, had just dis-

turbed the equanimity of Europe, and this was an additional reason for reinforcing the system of repression, which continued until the accession of Alexander the Second (1855.) Many innocent victims were involved in the conspiracy of Petrachevsky. The novelist, Dostoievski, narrowly escaped with his life, and was exiled for ten years to Siberia, where he wrote his touching "Reminiscences of the House of the Dead."

Saltikof and Turguenef, accused of connivance, were banished from Saint Petersburg; even Slavophiles, devoted to autocracy, were not spared. Chamekof was forbidden to read his verses, "except to his mother," and Assakoff, the great Panslavist himself, was under surveillance.

Alexander the Second (1855 to 1881) was the most liberal minded and generous of Russian sovereigns, but he was irresolute and inconsistent. He either could not, or would not, foresee the consequences of his acts and abide by them. The emancipation of the serfs, the institution of the Zemstvos or assemblies of provincial self-government, the establishment of local tribunals, of trial by jury and other reforms, succeeded each other too rapidly to mature and become really beneficial to the country. The nobles were at first ardent partizans of these reforms. They disputed for the honor of forming part of the Zemstvos, where they sat side by side with their recently liberated serfs, of whose labor they had willingly deprived themselves, and whose condition they sincerely sought to ameliorate.

Unfortunately, collisions with State functionaries and other difficulties, soon cooled their ardor. The

Slav nature, as we have remarked elsewhere, has an unhappy facility of passing abruptly from one extreme to the other, like the Russian climate. Excessive discouragement succeeded unbounded confidence and hopefulness. The nobles sulked and withdrew their co-operation, leaving all in disorder and incompleteness.

Instead of striving to repair the breach, the liberals, with their brains teeming with ideas borrowed from the German socialists, or picked up promiscuously during their foreign travels, thought the favorable moment was at last come to realize their ill-defined theories, and they clamored indefinitely for more liberties, more reforms. Their state of mind was very much like that of a people of whom an English statesman said: "They don't know what they want and they will never be satisfied until they get it."

There are, moreover, so many shades of opinion among them, so little coherence in their programmes, that if half the liberals obtained all they desire, the other half would be doubly discontented,

Their action is suspended for the time being by the rigorous conservatism which reigns during the present administration, and they will no doubt utilize their enforced inactivity to recast and mature projects of reform, adapted to the actual needs of the country, and become, in the future, the pillars of the new edifice, whose foundations are slowly and surely rising, though they do not yet appear above the surface. For Russia is inevitably gliding with the current of civilization and liberty, though the progress of so gigantic a raft is necessarily imperceptible. Sooner

or later, the accelerated movement will be felt, and in a few years the work of centuries will be accomplished, as has already been the case with Russian literature.

Meanwhile the fever for liberty became a veritable epidemic, which rapidly gained all classes. Nihilism was its acute form, and it attacked women more especially, and boys in their teens, rarely men of mature age.

Anarchy is one of the unwholesome, and perhaps, inevitable results produced in the struggle between young and vigorous elements, and the decrepit forms of the past. And in the Slav nature, unfortunately, there is an innate streak of anarchy, on which nihilism readily grafted itself.

It is this tendency of the Slav nature, which led to the dismemberment of Poland, that renders all essays of political freedom such difficult and hazardous problems in Russia, and prolongs the reign of autocracy. According political rights to a people who have always been debarred from them, is as delicate a task as that of administering nourishment to a man dying from prolonged fasting. The Government, therefore, acts with prudent firmness, in proceeding with protracted caution on the road of liberal reforms, in spite of the clamors of those, who would like to wrench Russia from her past, and precipitate her into courses, wholly foreign to her national genius and tradition, and, for this reason, eminently calculated to lead to anarchy and dissolution. Organisms must be judged, not in the abstract, but with regard to the conditions and environment in which they exercise their functions. Foreigners enamored of their own

political institutions, would do well, therefore, to suspend for awhile their declamations against autocratic despotism, and reflect, that all organisms, whether social, physical, or political, must mature and develop according to their respective laws and idiosyncracies. Nothing great has great beginnings, and nothing violent is stable.

Unfortunately, it is not the custom of the present day to indulge in further reflections on any subject. It is far more congenial to allow oneself to be emotionally stirred and carried away by some highly sensational account, be it of a social scandal, or of "*a horrible massacre of political exiles at Yakutsk, etc.*"

Nihilism was the Russian form of the Revolutionary blast, which has swept over the whole world, more or less, during the 19th century. In his clever essay on the "Decay of lying," Mr. Oscar Wilde declares that "the Nihilist, this strange martyr who has no faith, who goes to the stake without enthusiasm, and dies for what he does not believe in, is a purely literary product, invented by Turguenef and completed by Dostoievski." He might have traced the genealogy much further back, probably to the time of Adam.

About twelve hundred years ago Saint Austin, bishop of Hippone in Africa, said of some heretics of his time; that they were called nihilists because they believed nothing and taught nothing." (*nihilisti appellatur quia nihil credent et nihil docent.*) In recent times Bournof coined the word as a sort of in-

In his excellent work "The New Era in Russia" Col. de Arnaud has given a most interesting account of the origin of the word nihilism.

adequate translation of "nirvana," which, according to Max Muller, means literally "the action of extinguishing a light by blowing upon it."

"The passion of destruction is a creative passion," was the maxim of Bakounin, a most typical nihilist of 1848, whom Guizot expelled from France because he was a "violent personality." The destruction of all existing institutions, such was the programme that nihilism endeavored to execute, with the cruel melancholy despair of the Slav nature to which it appealed. It is said that, during one of his journeys, Bakounin passed a chateau which peasants were surrounding with malicious intent. Immediately, and without making any inquiry as to the cause of the riot, he organized them in bands, led the assault, and when the work of destruction and pillage was accomplished unconcernedly resumed his journey.

His conduct is highly characteristic of the nihilist movement in general; destroy first and examine afterwards, seems to be the password. Neither Bakounin, nor any of his colleagues were ever able to give a satisfactory reply, when questioned as to how they intended to replace the existing institutions which they sought to destroy; and, if it be allowed to coin a word, I would say that it is this very "negativeness" of their system, that keeps nihilists united to some extent; otherwise, there would probably be as many parties among them as among the Liberals.

Wholesale destruction, corresponding to wholesale negation; these are the pivots on which nihilism revolves. "There is neither God nor Czar," was the creed they tried to instil into the minds of the simple, super-

stitious peasants, so prodigal of belief that water sprites, and dryads, and elves do not come amiss to their credulous minds ; “Neither God nor Czar,” was the doctrine they preached to a people, whose political and religious creed is resumed in two words, “God and the Czar”—to a people, whom the rigors of their earthly destiny compelled to anchor hopes of bliss beyond the skies.

It goes without saying, too, that they preached in the desert.

Not long ago a nameless adventurer of the true Russian stamp, having placed himself under the ban of the law through insubordination to some meddling tchinovniks, emigrated with a few boon companions to Abyssinia, where King Negus took him under his protection and made him grants of lands. Fired with religious and patriotic zeal, Atchinoff, the grand outlaw, returned home to recruit subjects, and funds, and missionaries for his African colony. His words kindled a veritable enthusiasm, when, during the Grand Annual Fair at Nisni Novgorod, he harangued the assembled multitude in the name of Orthodoxy and Czardom, for whose expansion, he said, a new sphere was opened in the Dark Continent, far removed from the “vexations of Tchinovism and the “barbarism of Western civilization.” His listeners thrilled with an indescribable emotion, and every heart and every purse was opened to him. The poorest Moujik and the wealthiest city merchant placed all they had at his command, and would even have followed him there and then, if considerations of passports and other details had not stood in the way. At

Saint Petersburg, Atchinoff was received with the same enthusiasm. The shaggy, uncouth apostle of Czardom and orthodoxy was an honored guest in the palaces of the sovereign, and of the great families of the capital; while statesmen, publicists and men of science and letters received him with cordial deference. Only one class stood aloof and looked askance upon this 19th century Peter the Hermit. These were the bureaucrats; for this ovation to an outlaw of Tchinkovism was an aspersion upon their Order, and they resented it as a personal injury.

Whether this Abyssinian colony will become a "pou sto" for Russian expansion in Africa, a kind of San Francisco Slav, or whether it will die out with the death of its founder, Atchinoff, is a question that time will answer; but the incident in itself abundantly proves how strong a hold Czardom and orthodoxy still have on the Russians, and that they are not nearly ready to overthrow their altars and their thrones, as the Nihilists and their agents would have us believe.

De Tocqueville has remarked that the revolutionary spirit in our days proceeds on the same lines as religions do.

Nihilism, the religion of negation and pessimism, has its gods, its altars and its martyrs.

Its divinity (ostensibly, at least,) is the oppressed, long suffering people, to whom hecatombs of victims are sacrificed; and the names of these confessors and martyrs who die in penal servitude, or by the hands of the hangman, are inscribed in the calendars of the Nihilists. Their memory is surrounded with an aureole of glory, and hymns are intoned in their honor

worthy of a Saint Agnes, or a Saint Cecilia and her spouse, Tiberius.

This was the ideal side of Nihilism, which found so many votaries among young girls and University students. It appealed powerfully to the instincts of generosity and self-sacrifice, which are the noble apanage of youth, and it reveals, moreover, the immense capacities for practical enthusiasm and energetic initiative, that exist in the Slav nature, in spite of apparent intellectual torpor and physical apathy.

Above all, nihilism captivated young imaginations by the charms of mystery and danger, and flattered the desire for self-importance, so natural to human nature.

In his admirable work on "Russian Literature," Melchior de Vogué describes a morbid state of mind which is very prevalent in Russia, though by no means confined to that country. *Otchīnia* is the Russian word by which it is designated.

"If you consult your dictionary," he says, "you will find the word despair; but the dictionary is a poor changer, that never has the exact word, and offers you a domestic coin for a foreign one, without taking into account the difference of value. To translate this word adequately, would require several: despair, fatalism, asceticism, bearishness; I know not what else. *Otchāinia* is the sentiment which urges so many young people to betake themselves as it chances, to suicide, to the ambulance, to murder, to disorder; which leads this peaceful student on his way to assassinate, and this postillion who drives his horses at headlong speed among quagmires, intoxicated with

“the sense of unknown dangers. In a state of mind “like this, anything seems more endurable than a me-
“dium course.” (Roman Russe.)

It is also a melancholy fact, that in certain cases, the tortures of a high strung, ardent, ambitious temperament, writhing under the lash of overwhelming and hopeless poverty, have unhinged the minds of University students, and their extravagant proceedings are often attributable to a sort of hyperæsthesia, produced, literally, by the gnawings of cold and hunger. It would be unjust, however, as well as short-sighted, to make the Russian government responsible for these sad conditions, whose causes are to be traced far back into the past, and which cannot be conjured away with a magic wand.

Dr. George Brandes indignantly informs us “that it is the duty of School Commissioners to decide whether parents are sufficiently well off for their children to be admitted to a Grammar School,” (“Impressions,” p. 131) and, indeed it is quite customary to ascribe to a dread of the diffusion of knowledge, all measures taken by the Government to place restrictions on higher education. However, I leave it with the reader to judge, if there be not some benignant wisdom in placing limitations to the too rapid and disproportionate increase of the class of learned proletariat, (the most unfortunate, as well as the most dangerous of all *déclassés*), at least until suitable fields of activity can be opened to them. These much to be pitied youths of the intellectual proletariat have had their ideas and ambitious desires, inflated by a smattering of University lore, but being without stability or so-

lidity, and the means of self-help, they become the ready prey of all palaver, written or spoken. They believe, easily, that the world is all out of joint because they and their putative little talents do not receive the immediate recognition to which they think themselves entitled, and they seek a panacea for their ills in Nihilism, Fenianism, Red Republicanism, Socialism, Anarchism, according to the corner of the globe in which their lot happens to be cast. If, on the one hand, Nihilism casts a lurid light on the grand *sidès* of the Russian character, by the heroisms of self-sacrifice which it has called forth, we must also acknowledge, that a nation cannot be re-constituted with morbid elements such as it furnishes, and we cannot wonder that the Government multiplies and exaggerates its efforts to frustrate the rabid attacks of monomaniacs, who think they can overthrow a system by destroying individual lives.

A cause that is served and promoted by murder, "most foul, as at the best it is," is *ipso facto*, an unjust, and an unholy one, no matter by what high-sounding words we may choose to dignify it. Dynamite and the assassin's revolver are no longer admissible as social and political levers; and, if "free America," so easily carried away by a sentimental, misguided sympathy for all who appeal to her, in the name of that much travestied lady, "Liberty," refuse to conclude the extradition treaty with Russia, we may some day reap our share of the harvest of anarchy we are unwittingly, and indirectly, aiding others to sow.

It is a statistical fact that the greater part of the anarchists in the United States are German and Rus-

sian Jews, and the influx of this dangerous element has so greatly increased within a year or two, that worthy American Hebrews, having some sense of what they owe to their adopted country, are devising means for humanizing and civilizing the scum of the Slav population, which is being daily washed upon our shores, and may some day prove a far more serious inconvenience than the Mongolian colonies in our midst.

If blundering, uncalled for police measures are often irksome and pernicious, as they most certainly are in many instances, it is very regrettable no doubt, but we see no cause for surprise and indignation. Moreover, is Russia the only country in the world, where arbitrary administrative acts and vicious applications of the law occur, the only country where the innocent suffer with the guilty, the just with the unjust? In virtue of what law should anarchists be hanged in Chicago and left at large in St. Petersburg, and why should Vigilance Committees and Riot Acts not be operative in Russia as well as in countries supposed to be more civilized?

However great may be our self-righteous indignation against the summary measures taken by the Russian Government against political criminals, we all know that since the beginning of the world, the inviolable practice of every government, no matter what its form or appellation, has been, to borrow the language of the liberal Government, established not long since, in Brazil, the Benjamin Republic of the new world, "*to stamp out with unflinching severity all attempts to disturb the peace,*" or in other words, all attempts to overthrow the existing government.

It would, moreover, be puerile to declaim against what is an unfortunate necessity, for it stands to reason, that, but for such procedure, there would be anarchy and not government.

Unfortunately all the precautions taken were ineffectual, and Alexander the Second fell a victim to his noble self-forgetfulness, not less than to the bombs of the assassins. Had he not insisted on descending from his carriage to ascertain what injury had been done to a small boy on the road, and to one of his faithful Kosacs, he might have driven home safely ; the second bomb would not have done its fatal work, and Russia would have been endowed with a free constitution on the following day, for the Ukase by which it was to be promulgated lay on the Czar's table, only awaiting his signature to become law.

Were there any coherency, any rationality in nihilism ; if it were truly the exponent of the national aspirations, as it pretends to be, it must have triumphed at this hour ; so much the more so, that the new Czar, far from making any concessions to the revolutionary spirit, inaugurated his reign by a manifesto, deliberately opposed to the demands of these red-handed regicides, and in which he sternly and defiantly accentuated the autocratic prerogatives of the throne.

But, instead of seizing the reins of government and boldly ascending the rostrum, to proclaim the triumph of their cause to a grateful and acclaiming people, the nihilists, affrighted by their deed of horror, shrunk away like evil beasts to their dens at break of day, to escape the fury of the people, not less than the

pursuits of justice. Armed force was necessary to prevent the populace from demolishing the houses suspected of harboring the conspirators, whom they would have torn limb from limb; the whole nation was stricken with grief and horror, and nothing could exceed the pathos of the scenes enacted around the remains of the murdered Czar. Pilgrim bands of serfs, whom he had emancipated, came from all the adjacent provinces to kneel in the Sanctuary, where all that was mortal of Alexander the Second lay in state, and there, these strong, uncouth men, in rough tunics of skins, sobbed forth their grief like children beside the corpse of a beloved parent, and covered with their tears the hand now cold in death, that had stricken off their shackles. To this "day his tomb is constantly covered with fresh flowers, and multitudes weep and pray there still, though nearly a decade has passed since his death."

(Across Russia 1892. Stoddard, p. 62.)

The murder of the Czar Liberator was not the death of Autocracy, as the nihilists fondly hoped it would be. It was the apotheosis of autocracy. This was hardly what the conspirators had labored for, but it was the response of the people to their machinations in 1881.

Since the death of Alexander the Second, nihilism has been decidedly on the wane; indeed Russians of St. Petersburg say that it is "quite out of fashion," and that we know is fatal to any cause. It has never been as dangerous an element in Russia as Fenianism for England and Socialism for the German government, for nihilism endangers only the life of the Czar,

and the "Czar never dies." Two or three thousand nihilists scattered over a surface of nine million square miles can hardly offer any serious cause for alarm.

In London, Geneva, Zurich, and in New York, exiled Nihilists (some of them bearing the mark of Cain) who lead the forlorn hope of the party, endeavor to persuade the world that their number is always on the increase, and it is periodically announced that the day of triumph is approaching, which means that some new, diabolical plot is on foot, for ending the life of one of the noblest of men. Journals and periodicals in the English language have too readily given publicity to mendacious and scurrilous emanations from their pens, while the plots and woes of those who have fallen into the hands of the Government have furnished an inexhaustible theme for a great amount of catchpenny literature.

In Russian Universities and colleges, boy conspirators still play at Nihilism, and are made cats paws by unscrupulous Nihilists. The effervescence of these exalted young Slavs is severely repressed, and they are sent to Siberia to outgrow their malady, a treatment which is generally successful. For Nihilism is peculiarly a malady that attacks young people like the measles and the whooping cough, and it is worthy of remark that the most reactionary and conservative men in Russia were Radicals and Nihilists in their youth. The eminent publicist, Katkof, the novelist Dostoievski, and Tikhomiroff, implicated in the assassination of Alexander II, are striking examples of this veering of opinion, which cannot be attributed wholly to the dying out of the enthusiasms of youth.

The Czar is far more lenient than his ministers, and invariably condones youthful offenders when he happens to hear of their case, but he is without mercy to delinquents found in the ranks of the army.

I quote from Dr. Brandes "Impressions" a letter from a young woman of Nihilistic tendency, exiled to Siberia, which, if it be authentic and a true picture, would lead us to suppose that the young people of both sexes, whom the Government subjects to a kind of political quarantine in the distant provinces of the empire, are not extremely to be pitied :

"Dear Friends :—I can imagine that you are somewhat uneasy about me. But never in my life have I been happier. It is quite pleasant to be separated for awhile from my beloved husband, who was beginning to tire me. But that is truly one of the most unimportant things. I have been received here not as a criminal, but as a Queen. The whole town is made up of exiles, descendants of exiles, friends of exiles. They actually vie with each other in showing me kindness, nay homage. Every other evening I am at a ball, and never off the floor. This place is a true ball paradise," etc., etc.—"Impressions," p. 59.

The enormity of administrative meddling and police surveillance in Russian Universities will be explained and extenuated, if we recall that these Universities, which are of comparatively recent creation, differ entirely from those other European countries, in that the former are State Institutions, whereas the latter

were founded by private initiative, and only obtained charters from their respective governments when their existence was already well established. Moreover, they were primarily and essentially seats of learning, and not of political intrigue, which has been the tendency of the Russian Universities from the beginning, owing to the unfortunate necessity, that existed at the time of their establishment, of filling the different Chairs with foreigners, who generally happened to be German Socialists or French Jacobins.

The former element, in particular, has been one of the chief causes of the Nihilistic movement in Russia, for the German mind, saturated with Heine and Hegel, is essentially frondeur, and naturally opposed to any existing state of things, like that of a certain recently landed immigrant, who, when questioned as to his political views, unhesitatingly answered: "Hev ye a givrnment? then I'm opposed to it."

Very similar was the reply of one of Mr. George Kennan's protégés in Siberia, to a similar inquiry. "No government," was the prompt rejoinder, the curt formula, which was to redeem the nation from autocratic despotism, according to the notions of this hair-brained champion and martyr of Nihilism.

Altogether, it is the German element, administered to the country in such large doses since the reign of Peter the Great, together with the perpetual troubles caused by the hysterical proceedings of Russian adepts of German Socialism that are answerable for the alternating marches and countermarches in political progress, as well as in the organization and administration of the Universities. The Government finds

itself compelled to give with one hand and take back with the other; to make grants one day and repeal them the next. It is easy to understand, too, how this tergeversating policy bewilders and irritates the public mind, and reproduces the causes by which it is itself produced.

Even when they happen to be holding high official or military positions, which has been too often the case, Russians of the German kind, whether by their origin or by their Socialistic tendencies, are never really patriotic, except for their true fatherland, which is Germany, and I have frequently remarked, in the limited sphere of my observations, that Jews and Germans are the two great antipathies of the genuine Russian.

In his "Impressions of Russia," Brandes writes thus: "In 1887 the hostility in Russia towards the German Empire reached its height. They had the feeling that the future conflict was not very far distant, and what without qualification was significant for Russia, was the almost universal wish for defeat. The foreigner (meaning Dr. Brandes) heard this not only in Northern but in Southern Russia, and it made no difference whether the speakers were Russians from the east or from the west, provided they were able men who loved freedom (read Nihilists, they are always educated and love freedom) I have certainly heard the wish expressed by more than fifty Russians of the most varied classes of society." (P. 108 Impressions of Russia.)

If, instead of favoring the Czar's dominions, Dr. Brandes had come to America on a lecturing tour

during the Civil War, he would probably have met, in the different States, more than "fifty" Copperheads, of the Order of the Star, Knights of America, Knights of the Golden Circle, or "Sons of Liberty," all "of the most varied classes of society," and he would no doubt have consigned to future generations, in his "Impressions" of America, the startling fact that there was in the North, "an almost universal wish for defeat;" all the more so that these "Sons of Liberty" did not content themselves with passively wishing for defeat, but did all that was consistent with secrecy to procure it.

It may truly be said that nihilism has retarded Russia by fifty years at last. On account of it many odious measures of surveillance and repression that had fallen into desuetude were revived and enforced with new vigor, and it has armed the procurator of the Holy Synod against dissenters from the National Church, as if they were so many conspirators. Above all it has added thickness to the wall that separates the Czar from his people. Formerly the humblest subject could approach the sovereign in public and present his petition; to-day if any one were to attempt to do so, he would risk being shot down, or incarcerated and sent to Siberia in summary manner.

This is what the so-called patriots, who approach the throne with a "Petition of Rights" in one hand and dynamite in the other, have obtained for their country. They can never be its saviours, for in them the love of humanity has soured into hatred of society, while the people they pretend to represent, have, during nine centuries of Christianity, learnt at

least the one great lesson of brotherly love and non-resistance.

Mr. George Kennan has informed the public that when he appealed to Leo Tolsti to interest himself on behalf of political exiles, the great novelist, whose heart and life have been so freely bestowed on the poor, the lowly, and the suffering, answered only by the Scriptural Maxim : "They who use violence shall suffer violence."

CHAPTER IX.

RUSSIA IN ASIA.

Like the ocean, the stream of humanity has its movements of ebb and flow. Fourteen centuries ago Asia seemed too small for its inhabitants, and Europe was deluged by barbarian hordes from the East, who established colonies under the inclement skies of the North, as well as in the sunny plains of the South; colonies that were the nuclei of flourishing nations, who have, since many centuries, been the leaders of the human race in civilization and progress.

In their turn, these nations of Europe found their limits too narrow, and the same movement of expansion, to which they owed their existence has impelled them to the discovery of new worlds, and to the colonization of the lands of their origin in the far away past. Like Alexander the Great, we shall soon be lamenting that there are not more worlds, wherein to exercise our conquering activity, no transideral marts, whither to transport the surplus of our ever-increasing competition and over production.

Formerly European nations contented themselves with maritime colonies for the purposes of trade; to-day, pestilential deserts and barren rocky lands are at a premium, like vacant lots around capitals and growing cities. A century ago, it did not seem possible, that European nations should collide in the immensities

of Asia, Africa and the Indies. But, unfortunately for the equilibrium of peace, the points of contact are becoming more numerous from day to day. Witness the altercations which arose not long ago, between the Germans and the Spanish in the Carolinas, between the French and the Italians in Abyssinia, and this general scramble for foothold on the east coast of Africa. Have we not even seen the nation hedged about by a Monroe doctrine, nearly involved in a war with Germany about some insignificant island in the Pacific ocean? Fortunately for America, the Chancellor had his hands full, with troubles at home, and he was disposed to be conciliating, which does not, however, mean that the German government has relinquished one iota of its projects regarding Samoa.

Above all, who would have supposed half a century ago, that the interests of two nations, as far removed from each other as the East is from the West, would be clashing on the frontiers of Hindoostan? Certainly, no such contingency was anticipated when, at the battle of Plassey, 1757, the English supplanted the descendants of Baber, who founded the Mogul empire in India. Indeed, until recently, it might reasonably have been supposed that the wild Caucasian district, and the Steppes of Turkestan, with their nomadic banditti, placed an impassable barrier between the Russians and her majesty's Eastern Empire.

But there is no end to the surprises and contingencies, which beset the lives of nations. The indomitable Caucasian district, which seemed to preclude all expansion in that direction, is entirely pacified and Russianized, and has been made the base of military

operations in Asia Minor, the Bosphorous and Central Asia; while its rich petroleum mines have opened to Russia a source of new and promising industries.

Bokhara, the stronghold of Mussulman fanaticism, since many centuries, is, to-day, included in the Russian Customs Union, and is a main station on the great Trans Siberian Railway, which is in process of construction. Merv and Khiva, the inaccessible, are governed by the Russians; the pirates of the desert are enrolled under their banners, and the double headed eagle that floated on the standard, which Julius Cæsar planted on British soil, 54 B. C. is at the gates of British India to-day. The history of Russia's conquests is without a parallel in the annals of modern Europe.

Never since the old Romans subdued the known world, by civilizing colonies, as much as by the force of arms, has any nation so rapidly extended its frontiers. Nor are these conquests ephemeral triumphs, like those of Louis the Fourteenth and the First Napoleon. Like the Romans of old the Russians take possession of the soil by their agricultural classes, while their generals and their bureaucrats govern alike the conquering and the conquered races.

What was Russia's first incentive, and what is her ultimate aim in annexing territories three or four times as large as Germany to her already vast empire?

At the outset, she was no doubt unconsciously governed by the same natural law in virtue of which superior organisms invariably finish by absorbing their weaker neighbors; law, in virtue of which the Red Skins retreated, step by step, before the White Race,

until they were finally confined within the narrow limits of the Indian Reservations. There certainly was in the early aggressions of the Russians in Asia, something vague and unpremeditated, which concealed from themselves as well as from others, the vast scope of the desultory, haphazard advances by which they preluded their immense achievements in Central Asia.

But the Russians are too positive and realistic to be impelled by blind instincts and governed by occult laws. It is universally conceded that every civilized nation must extend its frontiers until they reach the confines of a nation able and willing to restrain its subjects from lawless depredations on their neighbors. The system of military cordons, maintained by the Russians against border warfare, in half-civilized districts, is both irksome and expensive, and it could hardly be expected that they would not dispense with them, as soon as they were able to do so by conquering their troublesome neighbors. But when this was done, other tribes more distant soon came to threaten them with the same dangers, and similar measures of repression became necessary.

The British Empire in India owes its existence to this very necessity of conquering and annexing, which compelled the Russians to make many undesirable and onerous acquisitions of territory. The conquest of Scinde by Napier, during Lord Ellenborough's administration is a notable example of these compulsory conquests. The British cabinet, (Sir Robert Peel,) were unanimous in their disapprobation, but the mischief of retaining this outlying province was less than

the mischief of abandoning it, and they were forced to acquiesce.

In a circular to the European Powers, Prince Gortchakoff, chancellor of the empire, explained how Russia was in the position of all civilized States, brought into contact with semi-savage nomads. "The State, he says, finds itself obliged either to abandon this ceaseless labor and give over its frontiers to perpetual disorder, which renders all prosperity, all security, all civilization an impossibility, or to accept the alternative of plunging, deeper and deeper into barbarous countries, where at every onward step the difficulties and expenses are increased."

The circular goes on to explain Russia's motives in subduing Central Asia. "No agent, it says, has been more efficacious in spreading civilization than commerce. The development of commercial relations everywhere, demands order and stability, but in Asia there must also be a complete change in the customs of the people. The first thing that Asiatic tribes must learn, is, that more is to be gained by favoring and protecting the Caravan trade, than by robbery. These elementary ideas can be made part of the public conscience, only where there is a social organization, and a government to direct and represent it.

Necessity, however, was not Russia's only law, nor was philanthropy her only incentive. She needed an outlet for her growing manufactures and industries, and saw no reason why Moscow and St. Petersburg should not supply the Eastern markets, as well as Birmingham or Manchester. And in this point she has

completely succeeded, thanks to her protective tariff and her Trans-caspian Railway. Not only has Russia supplanted England in the commerce of Central Asia, but she also controls that of Northern Persia. The rich and fertile province of Khorassan is commercially hers already, and its complete annexation, which is openly desired by the natives, is only a question of time. Last, but not least, with Persia as an ally, not to say a vassal, she will have a free sea coast for her maritime enterprises in the East, and the Persian Gulf will be little better than a Russian inland sea, like the Caspian. The English are making strenuous efforts to retain their footing in southern Persia, and regain their commercial ascendancy in Khorassan; but unfortunately for the success of their efforts, Persia is, from a military point of view, so completely at Russia's mercy, that during the Shah's visit to England, it needed only a little veto from the Czar to prevent the former from making any of the concessions the English were so anxious to obtain from him.

As to the ultimate aim of Russia's advance in Central Asia, there can be little doubt. In defending Constantinople, England defends her Eastern Empire. This has never been a mystery. That Russia attacks Constantinople in Asia, is also a well averred fact. "The Keys of the Straits, (Bosphorus and Dardanelles,) are in the Steppes of Asia," said the celebrated General Skobelev, the hero of Plevna, the Turenne of Russia.

It was after the disastrous Crimean war that the first campaign in Asia was undertaken. In a biography of Prince Gortchakoff, published in the Journal

of St. Petersburg in 1856, by the Foreign ministry, we read the following passage: "The Crimean war has shown that Russia cannot count upon the amicable relations which have existed between her and England since a century. It was indispensable to interest her, materially, in appreciating Russia's friendship, and seeking to preserve it. Only a strong position in Asia could attain this end."

The conquest of Turkestan was begun by the North. Orenburg in the south Ural district, being the point of departure, whence the invaders proceeded to occupy the Steppes of Kirghiz, and the basins of the Syr Daria and the Amon Daria, (the ancient Ixartes and Oxus,) while General Monravieff (Amoursky) extended the frontiers of Siberia in the southwest, by annexing the vast plains of the Amour, ceded by China, at the treaty of Aigon, (1858.) Masters of Tashkend, Samarkend, Khokand and Bokhara, the Russians could have reached Afghanistan by its northern frontier, but they preferred taking an easier route.

From Tiflis or from Batoum, on the Black Sea, to Bakou on the Caspian, is only a twenty-four hours' journey by rail. This inland sea, which virtually belongs to Russia, though the southern coast is Persian, is connected by rail with Moscow, and with central Russia by the Volga. It can be crossed in twenty hours from Bakou to Krasnovodsk, of which the Russians took possession in 1869. Under the hardy initiative of General Annenkof, (Melchoir de Voguës' brother-in-law,) a railway was built across the desert, over the Oxus to Merv and Samarcand; and thanks to this bold undertaking, the frontiers of Afghanistan

are within a few days' reach of the Trans Caucasian district, where Russia always maintains large armies and well supplied arsenals. It would take England much longer to send reinforcements from London to Kurrachee, and thence to Herat, or even from Calcutta to Herat.

Recent reliable accounts show that the Trans Caspian Railway, is by no means as insignificant and inefficient, as it was at first represented to be. The facilities it offers for mobilizing armies may be greater or less than they are represented, but no one can overlook the importance of the fact, that between Herat and the Russian Stations at Merv or of Meshed, only about 200 miles intervene.

How long would it take this hardy and enterprising people to span this little distance and perfect what has already been accomplished? Meanwhile, the Russians have scored an important victory, by the increased prestige that this Railway has given them in the eyes of all Asiatics, who look upon it as a far more remarkable achievement than the Indian Railways, which traverse thickly populated and fertile regions—to say nothing of the facilities that this Railroad affords for the ever increasing commerce with Asia.

In 1873, the Russians, with material aid from Persia, in the shape of provisions and beasts of burden, took possession of Khiva the inexpugnable oasis of the desert, and thus ended the first and least arduous of their campaigns in Central Asia.

Between the South Caspian District and Afghanistan, lived the formidable Tekkes, the terror of the Persians and of all their neighbors. After the Bulga-

rian war (1878) the Russians began against them a series of campaigns, which ended by the storming of their great stronghold, Ghéok Tepe, by General Skobelef. It is doubtful if any but Russian soldiers could have endured the hardships entailed by these campaigns. The French soldiers were discouraged before they could be taken as far as Khiva, and their revolt compelled Bonaparte to seek easier victories on European soil.

The vanquished Tekkes were invited to the coronation of Alexander the III, (1881) and, overcome with admiration for the magnificence and valor of their conquerors, they became Russia's most devoted vassals. Thanks to the influence exercised by their example, Merv, the capital of the Eastern Tekkes, opened its gates and welcomed the troops of the Czar, in spite of the efforts made by Anglo-Indian agents, who excited some bandit Sheiks to oppose the Russian army.

To please their new master, the Khans and chief citizens of Merv, of their own accord, released all their prisoners of war whom they held as slaves. And such was the last development in the checkered history of this remarkable city, whose earliest traditions carry us back to the time, when the Persian empire was in the zenith of its splendor, and Merv was one of its satrapies. After the death of Alexander the Great, and the dismemberment of his vast empire, Merv was rebuilt by Antiochus Soter one of his successors, and, this ancient city, which had been a Christian bishopric soon after the establishment of Christianity, became, in the eighth century, the field of religious strife caused by the schism of Mokannah, "the veiled prophet of

Khorassan." When the successors of Mahomet had absorbed the débris of Alexander's Asiatic Empire, Merv became the capital of Alp Arslan, the greatest Sultan of the Seljuk Turks. In the 13th century it was conquered by Genghis Khan, and since then, it has been a stronghold of Mussulman fanaticism, hermetically sealed to the profane eyes of unbelievers, until the beginning of the present century, when a few daring British travelers, took their lives in their hands, and ventured within its mysterious precincts.

There is every reason to believe that Merv has entered into a new phase of existence, and that "the Queen of the desert" is about to renew the days of her ancient splendor and prosperity.

Already, in 1879, the Anglo-Indians had taken alarm at Russia's encroachments in the East, and at what they were pleased to consider a "breach of faith" on her part. Indeed, there always seems to be, in English minds, an impression that Russia is, somehow, bound to keep her engagements, even if others break theirs. After the Crimean war had changed the *status quo* of Europe, and the policy of Palmerston had deprived the Persians of Herat, Russia was still expected to adhere, strictly, in her movements in Central Asia to what Nicholas had agreed to in 1844, under different circumstances. "The idea that England and Russia agreed to establish a neutral zone between their respective Empires, and that Russia has systematically violated the neutral zone agreed upon, is one of the delusions which, having once got possession of the public mind, it is very difficult to eradicate. There was an understanding about Khiva,

“but we must all admit, that it was a most unfortunate understanding, because no two persons are agreed as to what the understanding was.” It was thus that Lord Beaconsfield expressed himself on this subject, and though he had told the Anglo-Indians already, in 1876, that it was almost inevitable that all the Khanats would be conquered by Russia, their anxiety increased with every new progress. When Merv was taken, the alarm became so intense, that the English at home rallied their compatriots in India, on what was called their “*Mervousness*.”

But Russian aggression did not even stop at Merv. In 1884, the Turcoman Sarakhs followed the example of the Tekkes of Merv, and General Komaroff did not wait to be asked twice before he established himself at Serak on the Heri Roud, the stream that runs down to Herat. This was more than British equanimity could stand. War became imminent. It was conjured away *ad tempus*; but a *casus belli* is always pending on the Afghan frontier. If, and when, it will mature, are questions which time alone can answer with certainty.

Russia's administration in her Asiatic provinces has been bitterly denounced by Russophobists, and not without some reason. But the fault lies, not in her policy, but in the instruments she employs. She is certainly not so happy in her choice as Bismarck, who made a point of sending the best officials to administer the conquered provinces of Alsace-Lorraine. The Tchinovinks do not, as a rule, enjoy a high reputation at home: though there are some officials who are both honest and capable. But as these are in demand in

European Russia, the government of distant annexed provinces often falls under the administration of those who are neither honest nor capable.

Nevertheless, it is generally recognized that in all the countries where Russian rule has been established, the condition of the inhabitants has been greatly ameliorated. Their policy regarding the troublesome Caucasian district was even condemned as too humane. "They have generally adopted," said the Nihilist Klaproth, "a very defective system towards the people of the mountains; they employ gentleness and humanity, means which will never succeed, as they are regarded as marks of feebleness and fear." Mr. Oliphant, another hostile witness, writing about the Caucasian district, admits that Russian rule has been efficacious "in improving the material condition and in developing the resources of the country."

In 1876, when Russia gave the Kurile islands to Japan in exchange for Saghalien, only 625 of the inhabitants left this island, the great majority preferring to become Russian subjects; while, on the contrary, their subjects, in the Kuriles, all emigrated to Saghalien in order to remain under the scepter of the White Czar. Statements of this kind must seem surprising to strangers, whose only acquaintance with Russia is derived from sensational accounts of her cruel treatment of poor patriotic nihilists.

As a rule Russia is most tolerant to all religions, and by no means disposed to proselytise. It was a saying of Peter the Great, that "God has given the Czar power over the nations, but Christ alone has power over the consciences of men:" and it is a remarkable fact that

the religious tests, and disabilities debarring men from their rights as citizens, which existed in Free England until recent years, are unknown in Russia. Lutherans, Roman Catholics, Mahomedans, Anglicans, have held, and still hold, high positions in the State and in the army. Count Nesselrode, Alikhanoff and Loris Melikoff are a few examples of this absence of narrow-minded intolerance. The prejudice against the Jews, which is so strong in Russia, is, apart from all religious sentiment, a violent, racial and personal antipathy not altogether baseless; so that the treatment of the Semetic race in Russia can hardly be considered a religious persecution.

In the Nevaski Prospekt, at St. Petersburg, there are churches of so many different denominations, that it has received the sobriquet of Toleration Street. Sectarians of every creed, except those who have seceded from the National Church, and propagate immoral and criminal teachings, can raise their temples and worship God according to their own ideas, provided they do not proselytise. Czars, like Paul I and Alexander I, were, personally, well disposed towards the raskouliks, and even assisted at their meetings, but the State, for political reasons, has, since the days of Nikon, the Reforming Metropolitan, systematically persecuted all dissenters from the Greek Church, as well as enterprising evangelizers like Lord Radstock and his Russian adepts, who have sought to increase the numbers of these dissenters from the National Church, which is the symbol and cement of the National unity.

Russia's treatment of Poland has been made the

subject of much animadversion, but it must be borne in mind, that with the Poles religion has always been used as a political machine, and it was persecuted as such. Moreover, whenever the Poles have had the upper hand, Russians have found but little mercy, either as citizens or as members of the Greek Church. There was also, it must be remembered, a secular race rivalry between these two nations, and from the fourteenth century till the final dismemberment of Poland, it was a continuous struggle for the hegemony of the Slav nations. Poland acquired importance at Russia's expense, and Russia could only take the leadership of the Slavs at Poland's expense. Her treatment of Poland, therefore, was, after all, and at the worst, only a Roland for an Oliver. *

Russia's conquered subjects in Asia often embrace Greek Catholicism, when their own religion happened to be some vague polytheism, but Mahomedans rarely abjure their religion. This, however, is no obstacle to mutual good understanding with their conquerors.

There has been much discussion as to whether the Russians, General Komaroff in particular, acted with inhumanity towards the Turcomans. Schuyler says he did; Mr. Gladstone, according to statements made by an eye-witness, comes to the conclusion that he did

* A recent traveler writes as follows: "Warsaw is a cheerful and lively town. We had been in the habit of pitying the Poles. But the evident happiness of the people, the bright and handsome streets, the gay gardens, the grand congregations of Luthurans, Roman Catholics and Jews in their respective places of worship on Saturday and Sunday, dissipated our sentimental and gloomy ideas, and set us thinking whether, after all, the masses of the people were not happier and better off under the new regime." (*Across Russia*, R. Y. Stoddard, 1891, Scribner's, p. 232.)

not. This eye-witness, Mr. Macgahan, affirmed that "cases of violence towards women were rare, though the Russians were fighting barbarians, who commit all sorts of atrocities upon their prisoners, which fact might have excused a great deal of cruelty on the part of the soldiers; their conduct was infinitely better than that of European troops in European campaigns." Indeed, when some writers dilate on the alleged atrocities committed by the Russian soldiers in Central Asia, we are tempted to wonder if they never read the history of British India, and whether they ever heard of Sepoy regiments being blown away from the cannon's mouth; of the siege of Bada-jos, the destruction of the Palatinate, and a few other unfortunate episodes of war in modern times.

It would be quite uninteresting to enter into the circumstantial evidence for and against the Russians, so much the more so that there is much truth in the opinion of the philosopher, who said that short-sighted people should neither read nor write history. Microscopic inspection interferes with broad views and synthetic judgments. It is Russia's policy and achievements, in general, that we laud. A hundred years hence, it will matter little whether Komaroff, Skobelev or Kaufman did or did not resort to unnecessary severity in subduing some of these semi-barbarous tribes, among whom the women fought like men, and thus forfeited the peculiar consideration which is due to their sex. It will be remembered only that these vast regions were conquered to civilization by the Russians, and that the inhabitants have had no reason to complain of their new destinies.

Certainly, if it were desirable that Asia should be brought within the pale of European civilization, no nation is better fitted for the enterprise than Russia. She is a many sided nation, composed of so great a multiplicity of elements, both homogeneous and heterogeneous, that with all the nations of Asia she has some points of contact. None of the Teutonic or Latin races have, in an equal degree, her genius for colonization. She is an adept in the art, having practiced it all her life, for, as LeRoy Beaulieu remarks, "her whole history is a history of colonization."

She does more than colonize, she assimilates the conquered races, so that what was foreign before soon merges its identity into hers. Russia does not take possession of a country with sword in one hand and Bible or Cross in the other, but by her merchants and her peaceful moujiks, who readily fraternize with the conquered races. Her greatest strength lies in armies composed of soldiers, who are only moujiks in uniform.

"They are as brave as they are docile," says Cucheval Clarigny; "easy to content, supporting without "a murmur all kinds of fatigue and privation, ready "for anything; these soldiers construct roads, excavate "canals, make bricks, build forts and barracks, manufacture cartridges and projectiles, are masons, blacksmiths or carpenters, according to the need of the "moment, and the day after the regiment is disbanded "they will joyfully return to the plough. With such "instruments at her disposal, Russia's power will never "decline; a few years will suffice to render final the "conquest of any land on which she has set her foot."

These manifold functions of the Russian soldiers,

seem to be overlooked by writers, who describe the Czar's Asiatic Empire as a mere military settlement, where the natives are only held in subjection by the force of arms. The Trans-Caspian Railway, which was projected by soldiers, was built and is run by soldiers, chiefly. They are mains d'oeuvre, mechanics, engineers, brakemen, conductors, anything the case may require. Whenever there is a gap to fill, the Russian soldier expects to be called upon to fill it. In Central Asia particularly, he is by no means the specialist, in scarlet uniform, who hangs around barracks, goes to parade at certain hours, and fills up the vacant time with card playing and dram drinking, as is too often the case in British India. If, therefore, the number of Russian troops in Asia is more than fifty per cent. greater, in proportion, to the native population, than that of the British army in India, it is no argument for or against the popularity and security of the government of either of these nations.

It has been said that the secret of Russia's success in assimilating the conquered races in Asia, is due to the fact of her own inferior civilization. Whether this assertion be true or false, one thing is certain, there is, and there always will be, an immense difference between British Empire in India, and Russian Empire in Asia.

There is in the Anglo Saxon nature an unconquerable *morgue*, a sublime feeling of race superiority, which makes it impossible for them to amalgamate with those they consider their inferiors; and, as a race, they have, or think they have, no peers on the face of the globe. After more than a century of domination

in India, and in spite of the millions and millions which have been spent on missionaries and educational institutions, there is not the least rapprochement between the English and their dusky compatriots in India. During several years residence in Calcutta, I have been shocked by the heartless indifference and the utter contempt with which the native populations, or Europeans who have inter-married with them, were regarded. I have heard English gentlemen boast of having thrashed servants within an inch of their lives, and though this has been greatly modified within the last twenty years, it is doubtful whether the relations between the conquered and the conquerors are really more cordial than they used to be. The English never consider India as anything but a place of exile, where they must serve out a time of penal servitude, in order to accumulate a fortune, whereon to retire as soon as possible. And though they are glad to avail themselves of the services of educated natives as clerks in counting houses and shops, as it is far more economical than employing Englishmen, it is doubtful if Hindoos or Mahomedans will ever hold the high offices in State and army, to which they are entitled to aspire, by the rights of citizenship and the civil service examinations which some of them pass so creditably. Their exclusion from such offices is an anomaly and an inconsistency of which Russians cannot be accused, in regard to their Asiatic subjects.

Within a few years of the storming of Gheok Tepé, some of Skobelef's bravest opponents were raised to the rank of commanding officers in the Russian army; and in the civil administration, the fact of being a

native citizen, is no bar sinister against holding high office.

That Russia considers it her mission to civilize Asia, she has given abundant proof. Felt tents (Kibitkas) are fast disappearing before European constructions; bridges span the Syr Daria and the Amon Daria, the snorting locomotive has startled the shades of Tamerlane at Samarkand, and we may soon expect to see it branching off to Herat. The hideous slave traffic, that still flourishes in Morocco and at Constantinople, under the very eyes of the European Powers, has been abolished in Central Asia from the strongholds of Mussulman fanaticism, which are being rapidly converted into emporiums of commerce. Above all, the Steppes of Asia, for so many centuries the scenes of permanent rapine and pillage, have been made safe highways by these noble pioneers, of whom Le Roy Beaulieu says: "Civilization and humanity owe the Russians a gratitude that our Europe doles out to them with too much parsimony." "In our time," writes Carlyle, "they have done signal service to God and man, in drilling into order and peace Anarchial populations all over their side of the world."

Tashkend, so lately a den of brigands, is the capital of Russia's Asiatic Empire. It has a gymnasium, a public library, an Imperial Bank, and many factories. There are over 100,000 inhabitants, of whom six thousand are Russians. Schools have been opened by the Government for the natives, and periodicals are published, both in Russian and in Kirghiz.

Within ten years of the conquest of Central Asia the Russians had built canals capable of irrigating

forty-five thousand hectares. The extensive mines of these vast regions have not yet been exploited, but already cotton and silk of the finest quality are produced in abundance. As early as 1884 telegraph wires placed the Bokharan merchants in communication with the centers of trade all over the world, and over 2,000,000 cwts. of Bokharan cotton are sold annually at Nisni Novgorod, where it costs 3d. less than any that can be imported from India or America. Cereals and grapes are also abundant in many parts, and tobacco promises to be a valuable article of export trade. It is said that, for years, some 20,000 nomads of the Steppes were employed by General Annenkoff in the construction of his Railway, and worked cheerfully for a few cents a day. Certainly this is better than the system of degrading the native populations by liquor, and that of gradual extermination, to make room for the white race.

That the future of the vast continent of Asia lies in the hands of Russia and of England, is patent to every thinking mind. On these two nations has devolved the mission, more or less onerous, more or less lucrative, of introducing and promoting civilization in Asia. Shall her fertile plains be made the scenes of strife and carnage, or shall her ancient glories be restored, and her latent potentialities be developed by the combined efforts of Slav and Saxon?

CHAPTER X.

THE AFGHAN QUESTION.

Independently of its vital importance to the present, or to a future generation whom it may involve in one of the most dire wars the world has ever witnessed, the question of the Afghan frontier has a peculiar archaic interest. It is the liquidation of the old quarrel between the Irans and the Turans or Scyths, which carries us back to the time of Herodotus, and its final settlement will be the outcome of the secular struggle between the mountaineers and the inhabitants of the steppes of Central Asia. It is curious, too, to see an empire, composed of at least twenty different races, acting as the champion of the great ethnological principle, as the basis of national unity, which has been made the pretext of so much diplomatic manipulation in Europe, during the nineteenth century.

Unwittingly, Russia has acquitted herself of the mission of conferring political unity on Asiatic races, who were ethnologically linked together, though separated, politically, for centuries. But her work is still incomplete, and the question of the future is : Why should the Turcomans of Afghanistan not rejoin the community of the Turcomans of the steppes, united under the scepter of the Czar of all the Russias ?

Bismarck found that, according to the ethnological principle, the Gallicised Germans on the left bank of

the Rhine ought to rejoin their congeners on the right bank, and thereupon Alsace and Lorraine were incorporated with the German Empire. Europe and England assented. What objection can they make, if some day Russia decide that the Turcomans of the right and left banks of the Oxus should also, in virtue of these laws, be united under the same government; that Wakhan, Shignan, Roshan and other Khanates which were formerly dependencies of Bokhara should rejoin their congeners, and all form part of the great Slav Empire in the East?

"Afghan Turkestan must rejoin Russian Turkestan," said the Nihilist Prince Krapotkin, and Elisée Reclus, whose collaborator he was in the "New Universal Geography," distinctly includes in Russian Asia the dubitable territory, which the Anglo-Russo Convention of 1885 agreed to leave under the government of the Ameer of Afghanistan. "Geographically, the "upper Oxus and the northern slopes of the Iran "and Afghan plateau belong to the Arlo-Caspian "basin, and the growing influence of the Slav power "cannot fail, sooner or later, to unite in a single political group the various parts of this region." "Geographie Universelle," Vol. XI, Ch. III.

In signing the aforesaid Convention, the Government of the Czar reserved the usual loophole of unforeseen circumstances and the case of physical necessity, which soon presented itself. The Afghan patrols who occupied Pendjeh rendered themselves obnoxious to General Komaroff, and he straightway dislodged them, and established himself there, as he had already done at Zulifcar near Herat. The English

were indignant at what they considered a breach of faith on the part of Russia. War seemed inevitable, but fortunately for the world, both nations, for reasons of their own, earnestly desired peace. Gladstone, who had borne the brunt of Tory sarcasms, for his naive faith in the Czar's honorable policy, reaped the fruit of his far-sighted, liberal friendship for Russia. Had the relations of the Cabinets of St. Petersburg and St. James been strained at this time, as would have been the case under a Derby or a Salisbury administration, war would certainly have broken out.

To have averted another wicked, senseless waste of life and treasure, like the Crimean War, and brought about an amicable settlement, is not the least of the many services by which the Grand Old Man has achieved an everlasting name in the annals of great statesmen.

A survey by experts was resolved upon, and the debatable territory was unequally divided between Russia's subjects and England's protégés. The former retained most of the places occupied by General Komaroff, while the Ameer of Afghanistan was recognized as Suzerain of the little Khanates of the Upper Oxus, regardless of ethnological and geographical considerations.

And this till when?

Afghanistan, with its four millions of Afghans, Irans and Turans, has always been a thorn in the side of British India. On the effete Mogul races, and on the turbulent Maharattas, she could impose her yoke. But these Afghan mountaineers are as uncompromising in their love of independence as the Scotch.

Physically too, the Afghans resemble the sturdy, stalwart Highlanders, and, when seen in the marts and the streets of Calcutta, where they hawk around grapes and Persian kittens, they present a striking contrast with the puny native inhabitants of the plains of Hindoostan.

In 1838 and 1848, two disastrous campaigns were undertaken against this country of two hundred and sixty thousand square miles, "where small armies are annihilated and large ones die of hunger." But in spite of past experiences, Anglo-Indian Russophobists, (Sir Frederic Roberts and General McGregor,) actually succeeded in persuading the Tory Government of 1879 that it was urgent to conquer Afghanistan in order to prevent the Russians from invading India. A quarrel was picked with Shere Ali, and an expedition was sent against Herat, which proved a most deplorable fiasco, little short of the humiliating capitulation of the British Army at Cabool in 1840.

What England could not conquer she conciliated and protected. She has successively maintained and subsidized the Ameers Dost Mahomed, Shere Ali, and now, Abdur Rhaman, the cidevant pensioner of the Russians at Samarcand. And be it said, *en passant*, that all these gentlemen have more or less played upon Anglo-Indian "*nervousness*" for their own purposes.

By England's intervention Abdur Rhaman's frontiers have been delineated. She pays him a £120,000 a year for the privilege of giving him good advice, and as long as he is a good boy and follows it, she is engaged to maintain the integrity of his dominions, though she may not even have a representative at his

capital, where no English are allowed to reside, even in an unofficial capacity. Now as Abdur Rhaman has drawn his little allowance regularly, it is to be presumed that England is satisfied with his docility, and her honor and prestige would be compromised in the East, if she did not persevere in the policy she has adopted with regard to Afghanistan.

Questionable policy to say the least, for even should Abdur Rhaman be so fortunate as not to be prematurely deprived of his throne and life by tribal dissensions, and family rivalries, there will, almost inevitably, be at his death, a Russian and an English candidate for the Ameer'ship. It is already surmised that the Ameer's rebellious cousin, Ishak, whose antagonism to the English is notorious, will be Russia's candidate.

Moreover there is no certainty that the Iran and Turan subjects of the Ameer and of the Czar will always abide by the terms of the Convention of 1885, and content themselves with the frontiers assigned to them by their respective sponsors.

Now every nation has the right to extend its frontiers till they reach those of a ruler able and willing to restrain his subjects from lawless aggression on their neighbors. Therefore, if Afghan marauders do not respect Sir Peter Lumsden's boundary line in the future, and cause annoyance to Russia's Turanian subjects on the other side, she will be perfectly justified in taking the law into her own hands, and repressing them as best she can; by annexing some portions of Afghan territory if need be.

In either case the war which is staved off for the

present may break out, and both sides are well aware of this, as their continual preparations attest. Raids of the kind just alluded to, have already occurred on the Afghan border from time to time; but Russia is not quite ready yet to avail herself of some plausible *casus belli*. The future contest will be a Titan struggle between Slav and Saxon, and by no means confined to the frontiers of India. England has in Hindoostan an army quite able to cope with the Russians, but, thanks to the Trans-Caspian Railway, Russia's forces can be reinforced with comparative rapidity, while it may be in her power to cut off all communication between England and India, except via Cape of Good Hope.

At the International Convention in 1885, Russia tried, in vain, to have the same stipulations made for the Suez Canal, as those which existed since the treaty of Paris, (1856) regarding the Straits, (Bosphorus and Dardanelles.) England, on the contrary, strenuously maintained that the Lesseps Canal should remain open to all in time of war, well knowing that it would be available for her and her friends only, as she commands all entrance to and egress from the Red Sea, by her strongholds at Aden and Perim. But that ubiquitous Russia, after exhausting England's army in India, may some day confront her on the Isthmus of Suez with a few Kosac regiments, for whom it would be only a pleasant ride from Kars, in the Trans-Caucasian district, across Syria to Port Said. Asia Minor has seen more remarkable feats than this accomplished ere now.

In 1887 England and France, it is true, signed an

agreement to the effect that no hostilities should take place in the neighborhood of the Canal. But does this bind Russia, any more than the convention of the Straits bound England, when she saw fit to send her fleet into the Bosphorus, before there had been any declaration of war?

However, these are only idle hypotheses. Russia cannot conquer India by the force of arms, nor can England hold her Eastern Empire by these means. Even Asiatic nations are now too well educated to be held by mere military despotism. What England has to fear from the proximity of a Russian Empire at her very doors, so to speak, in India, is that her Hindoo and Mohamedan subjects will begin drawing comparisons; and if some day they make up their minds that they prefer the White Czar's government to her Majesty's, not "all the King's horses nor all the King's men," could uphold British Empire in India.

In an article on "Afghanistan and the Punjab," (Contemporary Review, January, 1879,) Professor Monier Williams writes; "Russia is far better informed than we are on all political subjects, European and Oriental. Its system assimilates itself far more readily than ours, to the present condition of the Asiatic mind. It brings with it the manifest advantages of organized government and security of property. Hence, Russia's advance is often welcomed in Asia as a boon, where ours is deprecated as a grievance, or barely tolerated as a necessary infliction."

Prestige, too, is an important factor with Asiatics.

The Trans-Caspian Railway has impressed the Oriental mind far more than the whole network of Indian Railroads, and only less than Russia's triumphal progress in Central Asia.

The unfortunate expeditions of McGregor and Roberts to Afghanistan, in 1879, coincided with the storming of Gheok Tepé by Skobeleff, and both events were simultaneously discussed by her Majesty's Indian subjects. With what comments, it is easy to imagine. More than ever is England obliged to conciliate them, and above all, maintain her prestige in their eyes; and to do this, she is bound, *coûte que coûte*, to adhere to the policy she has adopted regarding Afghanistan.

Mr. George Curzon does not think, like Sir Charles Dilke, that England is obliged, directly or absolutely, to maintain her Afghan protégé, and the integrity of his dominions. Agreements between Governments are so very elastic and web-like, and have been misinterpreted and broken so often, that it would be idle to dispute the judgment of either of these distinguished writers.

Of this however, we may rest assured, that were England's protégé worsted, and a Russian candidate established at Cabul on the throne of the Ameers, England's prestige in the East would be a thing of the past. Half-civilized peoples, like young boys, do not stop to weigh points of right and expediency; the only question with them is, "who licked?" and to him they forthwith transfer their homage and allegiance.

For these reasons, and for many others, it is always in the power of the Russians to annoy and harass England on her Indian frontier. Though of course, they

are not such egregious fools as to think of entering Afghanistan "with three columns of ninety thousand men" as General McGregor anticipated, when he wrote his "Defence of India," while suffering from an acute attack of Russophobia. Their plan would be to occupy Herat, and let the English take upon themselves the onus of penetrating into the fastnesses of Afghan territory, to protect their protégés, and Sir Peter Lumsden's boundary line, which he might as well have traced in the sands of the desert, as between Iran and Turan marauders.

In view of all these circumstances, it may well be admitted, that the Russians have fairly succeeded in executing Prince Gortchakoff's programme, "of interesting England, materially, in appreciating Russia's "friendship, and seeking to preserve it,"—which, he said, after the Crimean War, "could only be done by a strong position in Asia." Such being the case we may some day witness, instead of a bloody contest, an Anglo-Russo alliance, of which the Sick Man's inheritance would be the knot. England may realize the danger of again thwarting Russia in her views regarding the Balkan Peninsula. She may find it expedient to "agree with her adversary, while he is in the way," and secure the tranquil possession of her Indian Empire, by allowing Russia the privilege of "holding the keys of her house" in her own hands, or that of committing them to the keeping of some friendly Slav janitor of her own choice.

CHAPTER XI.

THE OTTOMAN TURKS.

The word Turk is not synonymous with Mahometan. It is a generic term, which may be applied to, at least, one-third of the inhabitants of Central Asia. There are Turk dialects which are spoken on the banks of the Lena in Siberia, and even beyond the Arctic circle, by men who are still pagans. Many Turkish dynasties have arisen, flourished, declined, and disappeared, according to the inexorable laws, which regulate and limit the lives of nations as well as of individuals. For nations, as well as individuals, have their periods of genesis, adolescence, maturity, senility and decline. And the crumbling away of a national body, in decay, often seems the necessary prelude for the inauguration of a new humanitarian cycloid in the world's existence.

The Turkish empire of to-day, whose capital is Constantinople, is that of the Osmanlis or Ottoman Turks, and it will not be uninteresting to consider, briefly, the origin of this power, whose direful yoke has weighed, for five centuries, on the fairest lands of Europe, and whose existence in these countries, once the birthplace of European civilization, is an anomaly, which can only be explained by rival jealousies, and secret ambitions of Christian rulers, who prefer petty national interests to the larger ones of humanity and progress, forgetting, that they are the descendants of

the Crusaders, who, from century to century, armed themselves against the encroachments of this same Moslem power.

But for the decisive victory gained by Charles Martel at Poitiers in 732, all Europe would probably have fallen beneath the yoke of the infidel Turk.

Later on, the victories of Ferdinand and Isabella drove the Moslem Moors from their last strongholds in Spain. But the Osmanlis Turks, more fortunate than their congeners in France and Spain, obtained a firm footing on European soil, where they still tyrannize over millions of oppressed Christians, thanks to the armed support given to them by British and European Christians, in order to maintain, what is so unmeaningly called, the "balance of power."

It is the history of this branch of the great Turkish family that we would briefly review in this chapter.

The name Turk, became known to Europe, as far back as the sixth century, when the chief of the Turks or Tartars on the littoral of Lake Aral, sent an embassy to the Emperor Justinian. But the term Ottoman or Osmanlis was not heard of till after the Fourth Crusade. About the middle of the thirteenth century Ertogrul, the warrior chief of one of the nomadic bands, who peopled Central Asia, was drifting westward towards Armenia, with his four or five hundred followers, when he reached a battlefield, where one side was decidedly losing ground. Without waiting to ascertain who the belligerents were, Ertogrul, the "right hearted," as he was surnamed, took the side of the weaker, and found himself, unwittingly, the benefactor of the Sultan of Iconium (Seljuk dynasty) who

was struggling against a formidable army of Mongols. In reward for his services, Ertogrul received a grant of land, and became a vassal of this Sultan.

His son Osman or Othman and his grandson Orkham, gradually emancipated themselves from their allegiance, and became independent sovereigns, having greatly increased their territory and power by the conquest of Greek settlements in Asia Minor. Brusa Nicomedia and Nicæ were stepping stones to the conquest of the capital of the Greek empire itself. Orkhom's son and successor, Armurath I, prepared the way to Constantinople by the conquest of Adrianople, which remained the capital of the Ottoman empire till 1453.

The Slavs of Servia and the Bulgarians, so recently the formidable enemies of the Byzantine Emperors, fell beneath the Moslem yoke, though not without a struggle. Their fate did not, however, excite much sympathy in Europe, as they belonged to the Greek schism. This fact has always been an unfortunate circumstance for the Balkan Slavs, diminishing the interest which would otherwise be felt in their fate by the rest of Christendom. Latin Christians, that is, Roman Catholics, have always looked upon them askance, because they did not recognize the Papal supremacy, though holding the same tenets in every other respect except one, (regarding the Holy Spirit,) while Protestant Christians consider that they are quite as bad, perhaps even worse, than regular Papists, without knowing exactly why.

When the Catholic States of Bosnia and Hungary were attacked, it was a different matter. All Europe was aroused. The Vatican proclaimed a crusade against

the Crescent, which was marked by the defeat of the flower of Europe's chivalry, ignominiously routed by the Turks on the battlefield of Nicopolis, (1370.)

In spite of the defeat of Bajazet I in 1403 by the victorious Tamerlane, and of ten years of interregnum and civil war, the Ottoman policy of aggrandizement was resumed by his successor, Mahomet I, (1421.) Under Amurath II Constantinople was besieged, for the first time, and it was finally taken by Mahomet II, in 1453.

The eloquent historian of the Rise and Fall of the Roman Empire has surpassed himself in the description of this tragic event, which marks an important era in European history,—the beginning of what are known as the Dark, or Middle Ages.

The last of the Western Cæsars redeemed, in his honorable defeat, the fallen glories of the descendants of Constantine the Great. But all the heroism of Constantine Dragases and his Paladins was unavailing. Constantinople was captured, sacked and pillaged by Tartar hordes, as Rome had been by Attila and his barbarians, some centuries before. The latter were, however, absorbed by the superior civilization they had overpowered. And out of the debris of the Roman Empire of the East arose a new and better world. In the Western Empire of the Cæsars, unfortunately, no such transformation occurred.

In 1454 the Peleponnesus was conquered, and Ottoman supremacy was also recognized in Asia Minor by the ambiguous and romantic Trebizond, with its shifting nationality and vague frontiers, which included parts of Georgia, Armenia and the Crimea. Walla-

chia and Albania were also subjugated about the same time, in spite of the heroic resistance of patriots like Huniades and Scanderbeg, while the Khans of the Crimea, the successors of Russia's enslavers, sought an arbitrator, and found a master in Mahomed II. His successor, Bajazet II, was by no means as illustrious. But under Selim the empire of Mahomed II was nearly doubled. Armenia and the Kurd districts, Egypt and Syria were conquered, and Persia narrowly escaped the same fate.

Selim proclaimed himself the champion of the Sunnite or Orthodox Mahomedans, as the Shah Ismaïl of Persia was the chief of the heretic or Shüte Mahomedans. Selim was essentially a proselytiser and a persecutor. His zeal, not less than his sword, conferred on him the title of Sultan of Egypt, and Calif of the Sunnite Mahomedans.

And now began the struggle with the Latin Christians. The Republics of Genoa and Venice were at this time the commercial queens of Europe; the former reigned in the Black Sea, and the latter in the *Ægean*, (Ionian,) with its multitudinous islands. Kaffa, the great emporium of Genoese merchants in the Black Sea, was taken and plundered, and fifteen thousand young Genoese were enlisted as janissaries.

Venice was deprived of several important islands, such as Lesbos, Lemnos and Cephalonias, and she was fain to conclude an alliance with the Sultan, in order to save her territory of Friuli from devastation.

The Ottoman navy began to be the most powerful in Europe, and the coasts of Spain were ravaged by the Ottoman Turks, by way of avenging the expulsion

of their cousins, the Moors, from Granada. Otranto was taken in 1480, and nothing but the heroic resistance of Pierre d'Aubusson, and the Knights of St. John could have retarded the fall of Rhodes. To Solyman the Magnificent was reserved the triumph of reducing this insular stronghold, which had repulsed his victorious predecessor, Mahomed. "There has been nothing so well lost in the world as Rhodes," said Charles Quint, when, after this memorable siege, which lasted six months, he consoled the Grand Master, Lisle d'Adam and his Knights with the gift of the Island of Malta, whence, later on, these valiant antagonists of the Turks in the Holy Land, twice repulsed the Ottoman fleet.

In 1526, Hungary sought the alliance of Turkey in her struggle for independence against Austria. The Turks were defeated by the Austrians at Vienna, in 1529, but this did not prevent their acquiring Hungarian Territory. Such was the beginning of the long hostilities between Austria and the Sublime Porte, of which the chief events were the victory of Lepanto, 1571, where Don Juan of Austria, commanding the allied Spanish, Venetian and Papal fleets, routed the Turks under Ali Pacha; and the great battle of Saint Gothard on the Raab, where the French and Austrians, under Monteenculli, defeated the Turks in 1664. In 1683, Sobieski, King of Poland, gained two signal victories over them at Lemberg, and at Vienna; they were finally routed, at Zenta, (on Theiss, 1696, a tributary of the Danube,) by Austria and her allies, commanded by Eugene of Savoy; while from another quarter, these Moslems were beginning to be harassed

by their most persistent and formidable enemy, Russia.

With the Czar they concluded an armistice of two years; and with the allied Powers, the treaty of Carlowitz was signed, (1696,) by which the Morea was given back to the Venetians, Podolia to the Poles, and a large portion of Hungary to Austria.

At the preliminary conference, which was held by the Powers, Holland and England, both at that time under the government of William of Orange, were represented, though they had taken no part in the war. It was the first recognition of an international solidarity so to speak; and the first indication, too, of the interest England began to feel in maintaining the "sick man," whom she has so zealously propped up in more recent times.

Already at this period, (1696,) the decadence of the Ottoman Turks had begun.* The weakness of the Sultans threw the administrative power into the hands of the Grand Viziers, who began to play the same part as the Mayors of the Palace, under the degenerate Frank Kings.

During the reign of Selim, the Zealot, and the persecutor, the Turkish Empire was nearly doubled, in the 15th century as we have already seen. The Ottoman Fleet was at that time the finest in Europe, and

*Indeed Baker, a most ardent Turcophil, and Russophobic, informs us in his work on Turkey, that "After the possession of Constantinople, (1453,) we find the Sultans and consequently the nation, gradually becoming more apathetic and corrupt." And that the era of "Turkish Anarchy commenced after the occupation of Constantinople, and lasted until Mohamed II, 1808." "Turkey," p., 167.

If Mr. Baker had said "lasted to the present day," it would be more correct. * * * * * * * *

“no State had then executed larger and better public works than the Turks.” (Dumont.)

It was also the period of the building of the great Mosques, which are falling into ruins to-day, for want of funds to keep them in repair. The cause of the decline of the Osmanlis Turks, is attributable chiefly to the cooling of their religious enthusiasm, and the lack of battle fields. Religious fanaticism, leading to war and conquest, was the generating principle of Mahomedan power from the beginning, and with the weakening of this sentiment, there came a corresponding decline in the power of the government.

Though the Turks are less amenable to proselytising influence than any other nation, and have rarely embraced Christianity in any form, they did not escape the anti-religious current which has pervaded Europe since the seventeenth century, and, as religious faith, was, with them, the source of all courage, devotion and loyalty, these qualities, necessarily diminished and disappeared, with the parching up of the fountain head.

European civilization provided codes of honor, as well as social and legal mechanisms, to restrain lawless propensities, thus substituting civic virtues, for those inspired by religion. But, in Turkey, unfortunately, no such substitution was made.

Other Mohammedan nations, the Saracens, the Moors in Spain, the Moguls in India, have achieved much, both in art and in science, but these Osmanlis Turks have never been anything but a military power, the incarnation of brute force. Since five hundred years they are nothing but

an "army of occupation in a conquered country." No bonds of amity or affinity have ever existed between them and the nations of Europe, by whom they have always been regarded as aliens and intruders. Like Ishmael of old, their "hand has been against every man, and every man's hand has been against them." To all Slav nations, to Russia in particular, the Moslem Tartar or Turk was a natural and irreconcilable enemy, and they lost no opportunity of reminding him of the fact.

Venice and Genoa, the two great maritime powers of Europe, before the scepter of the ocean passed to England, never recovered from the wounds inflicted by Turkey. Spain resented the piratical aid they gave to their kindred, the Moors; and Austria, the wars waged against her on behalf of Hungary, herself the rueful victim of her cruel, greedy, devastating ally.

It is true that Elizabeth of England, styling herself the "unconquered and puissant defender of the faith against the idolaters who profess the name of Christ," (Roman Catholics,) bespake the help of Amurath's navy against Spain, and that Francis I sought their alliance in his Italian wars. Nevertheless, it is an incontrovertible fact that Turkey's relations with European nations in the past, were never those of equality and friendship.

Since the Treaty of Carlowitz, 1696, they have been used only as cats-paws or as pawns in the political game by European powers, who formed alliances with or against them, with equal readiness.

The Turks of Constantinople, unlike other conquerors, have neither absorbed the conquered races nor

been absorbed by them. And after centuries of domination, we still see the spectacle of a nation placed over nations, with whom they have nothing in common, and whose obedience is only secured at the sword's point.

Difference of race and their position as conquerors, cannot explain this phenomenon of non-amalgamation, for all the nations of Europe have begun, more or less, by a conquest; but the fusion of the conquered and the conquerors has always taken place sooner or later.

This fusion, however, can never take place between Turks and any Christian people while both remain themselves, and Turkish influence is paramount. For the two systems are radically opposed on the very points which constitute their respective identities, and distinguish Eastern from Western nations. These two points are polygamy, and its concomitant, slavery. For here it may well be said that "deep calleth unto deep." Slavery leads to polygamy, and polygamy leads to slavery.

It may be objected that both polygamy and slavery have existed among Christian nations. This is true, but with the important difference, that both were utterly abhorrent to the genius and teachings of Christianity, and were inevitably destined to be stamped out sooner or later. Nor is this all.

It is a fundamental law of Mahometanism that there shall be among Moslems no amalgamation with Christians, whom their creed enjoins them to consider, and to treat as "dogs." Whoever has lived in Mussulman countries understands the full force of the opprobrious epithet. It does not refer to the noble domestic canine

we are accustomed to, in civilized countries, but to that multitude of despised, homeless curs, which hang around native villages, and are often driven by hunger and ill-treatment, to betake themselves to the savage state, where they join the community of the jackals, which appear to be half wolves and half dogs.

Social and political equality between Turks and Christians is, therefore, utterly incompatible with the genius and the organism of Mahometanism, and to treat them on a par, would be a burning away of barriers, that implied nothing less than a renunciation by the Turks of their own existence, as a political and religious body.

In view of these facts, it seems marvelous, that British statesmen should ever have believed, or affected to believe in the possibility of effecting any radical reforms in the Turkish government of Christian nations.

It is a common saying that "the wish is father to the thought." And as the English were determined to support the Ottomans, in order to prevent Russian expansion on the Black Sea, they were fain to persuade themselves and the world, that they could pursue their policy in this regard, without grossly sinning against the rights of humanity, by maintaining incorrigible oppressors of many millions of Christians.

And thus it happens that from year to year, the "quart d'heure de Rabelais," is indefinitely prolonged for these irreclaimable miscreants. Whenever new wrong doings come to light, it is pleaded that Russian intrigue hampers the Turks, that "they must have time" to carry out the long promised reforms; and the blame

of the non-fulfilment of often reiterated promises is laid everywhere, except where it really lies.

England's policy regarding Turkey has been euphemistically described by a recent writer as a singular infelicity. "It is, beyond dispute, writes Robert Mackenzie, a singular infelicity, that a great Christian State should feel herself impelled by any consideration of her own advantage to the performance of a task, which involves consequences so lamentable."

"(The Nineteenth Century," a history, page 402.)

Posterity, we think will use harsher terms in describing England's attitude in the Eastern Question.

CHAPTER XII.

TURCO RUSSO WARS.

We have seen that there is among the Russians a traditional belief in their hereditary right to Constantinople, and that there are moreover, historical, religious and ethnological reasons for regarding all Turks as natural enemies, whom it is their mission to lose no opportunity of weakening and expunging from the map of Europe.

The crusade of extirpation from Russian soil was begun by the Grand Duke Dimitri Donskoy, who drove the Tartars from the basin of the Don. It was continued by Ivan the Third, (the Great) at the instigation of his wife, Sophie Paleologus, niece and heiress of the last Greek Emperor of Constantinople, whom the Turks had overthrown. And, finally, Ivan IV (the Terrible) drove the Moslems from their last strongholds of Kazan, (1552) and of Astrakhan, (1554.) The defeat of Kazan was to the Turks in Russia, what the defeat of Abderame by Charles Martel, and the battle of Las Navas de Tolosa, were to them in France and in Spain. The back bone of their power in these countries was broken forever. The vast regions of Siberia were also conquered from the Tartars during the reign of Ivan the Fourth, and this

conquest was the beginning of Russia's reprisals in Asia, against her *ci-devant* dominators.

However, the Khans of the Crimea, who were vassals of the Sultan, still remained, and they were troublesome and treacherous neighbors. The first expedition undertaken against Azof (1695) failed, for want of a navy. The undaunted Peter the Great immediately assembled twenty-six thousand workmen; and with the aid of foreign officers and engineers, a rough flotilla was rapidly improvised, none working harder than the royal "Carpenter of Saardam" himself. Twenty-two galleys, a hundred rafts and seventeen barks, all made of unseasoned timber, such were the humble beginnings of this navy, which now holds, perhaps, the foremost rank in Europe. For, since 1881, Russia has been building at the rate of about four armor clads and as many cruisers every year. Azof was taken, (1696) and Peter returned in triumph to Moscow. Even the national party, who hated and antagonized his foreign innovations, smiled upon the victor of the Moslems, forgot their shaven chins, and half forgave his blasphemous contempt for their antique usages.

A few years later, Peter, in endeavoring to extend the Russian frontier to the Baltic sea, involved himself in a war with Sweden and Poland. The moment was favorable for the Turks to recover Azof, and they declared war against Russia.

The Russians, elated with their recent victories over the Swedes and Poles, entered into the new crusade with enthusiasm. They thrilled with delight at the prospect of retracing the footsteps of their Vareg

Princes, who hung their shields on the walls of Constantinople many centuries ago. The prospect of exterminating the old enemies of the Slav and affranchising their brother Christians in the Balkan Peninsula, seemed so certain. Wallachia, Moldavia, Servia, Montenegro and even the Greeks, invoked the advent of Peter the Great, in whom they saw a champion and a liberator. They eagerly promised their co-operation, but, at the critical moment, they all failed him. And Peter, with only thirty-eight thousand men, was surrounded on the banks of the Pruth, by an army of two hundred thousand Turks and Tartars. After a brave but hopeless struggle, in which eight thousand janissaries perished, nothing was left but to capitulate. The Treaty of Pruth (1711) was signed, and Azof was surrendered to the Turks.

The Black Sea was lost to Russia for the present, but Peter took advantage of troubles in the Empire of the Shah, to gain a footing on the Caspian Sea. The now important town of Baku was taken, and Daghestan and Asterabad were occupied.

To punish the Russians for the part they had taken in the defeat of Stanislas Lezenski, their candidate to the crown of Poland, the French incited the Turks to declare war against Russia again. This war lasted four years, and was ended by the Treaty of Belgrade, (1739,) brought about by the mediation of Austria, to whom the proximity of the Russians, was far more objectionable, than that of the Turks themselves. Russia gave back all her conquests, except a strip of territory between the Boug and the Dneiper.

In 1768, the Duke DeChoiseul, by way of operating

a diversion in favor of Poland, urged the Turks again to declare war against Russia. A violation of frontier by Russian Troops, in pursuit of "Haidmak" marauders, was made the *casus belli* of this war, which resulted disastrously for Turkey, and indirectly so, for Poland, whom the European Powers sacrificed to the victorious Bear, so as to induce him to relinquish some of his spoils in the Balkan Peninsula. For, Russia had not only re-conquered Azof and the Crimea, but she had also taken Bessarabia, Wallachia, Moldavia, part of Bulgaria, and some of the Ionian Isles; and her victorious army was at the very gates of Constantinople.

The Sultan, Abdhul Hamid, signed with Catherine II, the treaty of Kairnadji, (1774,) by which Russia acquired a right of Protectorate over the Christian subjects of the Sultan, to whom the latter promised to accord a general amnesty, for the part they had taken in the war.

Russia also obtained many strategic points on the Black Sea, and thus prepared the way to the annexation of the whole littoral. The Crimea, a tributary of the Sultan, was also declared independent by the treaty of Kairnadji. But, during the years which followed, the Khanat was the scene of perpetual anarchy and civil war, between the party that favored the Russians, and the party who inclined to the Sultan. Thirty-five thousand Christians, (Greek and Roman Catholics and Armenians,) emigrated to Russia, (1780,) and in 1793 the Czar formally annexed this peninsula whence Tartar Hordes, had, since the thirteenth century, sallied forth incessantly, to burn, pillage and

destroy unfortunate Russian villages and towns. Thus, was obliterated the last memento of the hateful Mongol domination.*

About this time Catherine II and Joseph II, of Austria, were forming what was known as the "Greek Project," the object of which was the re-constitution of the Byzantine Empire, as it existed under the Western Cæsars. The Grand Duke Constantine Paulovitch, it was agreed, should renounce all his rights to the Muscovite throne, and reign at Constantinople. Meanwhile Catherine took Circassia under her protection, and during her journey through this country, triumphal arches were everywhere erected, with the defiant inscription, "Road to Byzantium." Of course, the Sultan could not be expected to look on unmoved. In 1787 he sent an ultimatum, requiring the Russians to relinquish their protectorat over his vassal Heraclius, prince of Circassia, and claiming also the right to make perquisitions on Russian vessels navigating the Straits, as well as that of sending commissions to all the Russian ports. A flat refusal to each and every demand was the only reply vouchsafed. And again, war broke out between these irreconcilable neighbors. The Russians were ill prepared for hostilities at this moment, as a violent storm had just dismantled their fleet in the Black Sea. But the promptitude and energy of the Great Catherine supplied all deficiencies, met all emergencies, and prepared victories for her

*Nor have these descendants of the Tartars of the Golden Horde, had reason to regret the change. In September, 1854, the villagers of Eskel, assured Mr. Kinglake that "They wished for no change, "and excused their content in their simple way by saying that for "three generations their race had lived happy under the Czars." ("Crimean War.")

people, where disasters might well have been feared. Her correspondence with her generals and admirals, at this time, well entitles her to the surname of "Semiramis of the North."

Koutouzof, Potemkin and the impetuous Sovarof reaped many laurels on Turkish soil. And finally, the Sultan, finding that the Russian fleet was dangerously near Constantinople, negotiated for peace, which was concluded at Yassy 1792. Russia obtained Otchakof and the littoral between the Boug and the Dneister, and stipulated for new guarantees on behalf of the Danubian principalities. Austria had been Russia's ally during the greater part of this campaign.

But peace between Russia and Turkey can never be anything but a truce. At the beginning of the present century, the Sultan, at the instigation of his ally, Bonaparte, again declared war against Russia, then combined with England, Prussia and Austria to overthrow the First Consul. By way of picking a quarrel, the treaty of Yassy was violated by the deposition and exile of the hospadors of Wallachia and Moldavia.

At the same time the Janissaries of Servia were braving the Sultan, on the one hand, and driving the Christians to revolt by their cruelty on the other. The Porte authorized the armed resistance of the Christian peasantry against his turbulent Janissaries, but when the former were ordered to lay down their arms and give up the fortresses they had taken, they refused to do so, and under the leadership of Kara George, a pork merchant, the Servians proclaimed their independence.

However, they would soon have been overpowered

by superior forces, if Russia had not come to the rescue of these brave patriots.

At Tilsit, where Bonaparte treated with the allied powers, whom he had defeated at Austerlitz, Friedland and Eylau, there was a secret agreement entered into by Napoleon and the Tzar, Alexander the First, to deprive the Sultan of all his European provinces, if he did not soon come to terms with the Serbians. The perspective of an unmolested high road to Constantinople, made Alexander the dupe of Napoleon, who was betraying his Turkish catspaw only in order to secure Russia's neutrality, and thus forward his own ambitious projects in Spain and Portugal, where he was preparing to dethrone the Bourbons and the House of Braganza.

The Franco-Russo alliance found no partisans in Russia, but the Tzar and his minister Speranski. It was openly antagonized by the Russians; and Savary, the French ambassador, complained, "that every door "in Saint Petersburg was closed against him, while "in the churches, public prayers were offered against "France and Napoleon Bonaparte." (So much for Russian Slavishness.) The tragedies of Borodino and Moscow, a few years later, fully justified the antagonism of the nation, for this "traitrous place," as it was called by the English ambassador.

The Turco-Russian war continued till 1812, when it was brought to a close by the Treaty of Bucharest. Russia retained Bessarabia, with the fortresses of Bender and Khotin. The Pruth and the lower Danube, with the strongholds of Ismail and Kilia, marked the boundary line between the two empires; the hos-

padors of Moldavia and Wallachia were reinstated, and the autonomy of Servia, under the government of Kara George, and a national assembly (Souptchkina) was stipulated for.

But the treaty of Bucharest, too, was cast to the winds, almost immediately, by the perfidious Turk.

In 1812-1813, while Russia was engaged in a life and death struggle with Napoleon, on her own territory, Servia's new born liberty was cruelly stamped out, and her leaders fled, or were tortured to death by their barbarous task-masters, the Ottoman Turks, from whom they thought they had escaped.

One patriot, Miloch Obrenovitch, still held the Moslems at bay, to some extent. Encouraged and aided by Russia, he gave the signal for a new insurrection when the oppression became intolerable. And the Porte was again compelled to recognize the independence of Servia. The whole Balkan Peninsula, and even the Greek islands, throbbed in sympathy, and were repressed relentlessly. The Mussulman population rose in a mass against the Christians. The Greek patriarch, three arch-bishops, eight bishops and thousands of Christians, were massacred on Easter Sunday, (1821.)

Alexander the First, who seems to have fallen a victim to some moral marasma, towards the end of his glorious and eventful reign, intervened, but very feebly and ineffectually, and the persecution of the Christians continued until the Tzar's premature and mysterious death, which has been attributed by some to his failure to accomplish his mission, as the mandatory of the Slav vendetta against the Moslem.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE CRIMEAN WAR.

When Nicholas ascended the throne (1825-1855,) he made it his first duty to call the Turks to account for the outrages committed in the Balkan Peninsula, and the violation of the treaties regarding the Danubian principalities. The Sultan submitted to Russia's ultimatum, and agreed to the stipulations of the Convention of Ackerman, (1827,) which did little more than confirm the Treaty of Bucharest. It was a new and formal recognition of Russia's protectorate over the Eastern Christians, and her right to free navigation in the Black Sea and the Straits.

With regard to Greece, Nicholas acted in concert with England and France.

The three allied powers demanded the recognition of Greek independence, and the Sultan responded to their ultimatum by sending an army into the Morea, (October, 1827.) The Ottoman fleet was destroyed at Navarino by the allies. The French expelled the Turkish army from Greece, and the Russians occupied Moldavia and Wallachia, took Varna, Brailof, and in Asia Minor, the stronghold of Kars. Scarcely was all this accomplished, when England began, already, to regret her fit of generous enthusiasm on behalf of the struggling Greeks, which had brought about the destruction of the Turkish fleet. The Russian bear

must be muzzled, and the Turk must be upheld in behalf of British interests. The glorious victory of Navarino was actually alluded to in the next Royal speech as "an untoward event." In Mr. Kinglake's elegant language, "it was a deflection, caused by romantic sympathy with the Greek insurgents." (p. 38, Vol. I, Crimean War.)

Austria and France, for reasons of their own, shared England's misgivings, and the way was being prepared, indirectly, for that monstrous alliance of Christian nations to crush the only champion of the Eastern Christians, so recently their ally and co-operator, in this glorious war of Greek Independence, of which the poet Byron had been one of the chief instigators.

The coalition for Greek Independence marks an era of transformation in politics, and was, so to speak, the last act of old world policy in Europe. In former times, it was the business of diplomacy and war to prevent the preponderance of a dynasty, to secure the triumph of a principle, of a theory, of a passion even; witness the innumerable wars of Succession, the wars of Investiture, the Thirty Years' War to maintain the unmaintainable religious unity of Europe, and many other sanguinary struggles to uphold an idea.

But, henceforth, commerce, not ideas, will rule in the Council Chambers of the world. Politics will be forged in counting houses and warehouses, "where only the ledger lives," and in whose dusty atmosphere, none but merchantable ideas are current. Wars will be declared, alliances will be formed, or repudiated, not according to any principles of justice, or equity, but according to their probable effect on the pulse of the

market. Men will be elected to represent their borough, their county, or their country, not with regard to personal merit or patriotism and capacity, but to reward party services, or because they will push forward, or veto such and such a bill, supposed to be favorable to this, or that industry.

In consequence of this transformation the policy of Russia, who is very slow in her evolutions, owing to her bulk, and peculiar moulding, became an anachronism. The idea of a chivalrous intervention on behalf of oppressed fellow Slav Christians, appeared quite superannuated and quixotic ; and it was scoffed at, or attributed to motives of self interest and ambition.

In 1829 Turkey sued for peace, and signed two treaties at Adrianople ; one with the allied powers, and one with Russia, in particular. By the first, she recognized the independence of Greece. By the second, she surrendered the islands of the Danubian delta, renewed with Russia her former engagements regarding Moldavia, Wallachia and Servia, and confirmed the right of protectorate over the Eastern Christians, given to the Czar at Kainardji, and renewed, implicitly at least, in every succeeding treaty between Russia and Turkey.

In 1833 the Khedive, a vassal of the Sultan, had a quarrel with a fellow vassal, the Pacha of Syria, whose territory he invaded and captured many strong places. Constantinople itself, was threatened by the victorious vassal, and it was Russia's aid, strange to say, that the Sultan sought in this difficulty. Count Orloff concluded with the Porte, the singular Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi, (1833,) a kind of defensive and

offensive alliance, which, however, in the relative positions of the two nations, was really equivalent to a Russian protectorate over Turkey in the near future.

The European Powers could not, of course, approve of this arrangement, so they undertook to protect Turkey, conjointly with Russia.

In 1839 the ambitious Khedive of Egypt again began hostilities. The blockade of all the ports of Syria and Egypt was declared by the European Powers; Admiral Stopford bombarded Acre, Napier defeated the Egyptian army, and made a convention with the Khedive, promising that his sovereignty in Egypt should be recognized, if he would withdraw his troops from Syria, and restore the Ottoman fleet. The Sultan at first refused to ratify the Napier Convention, but he was compelled to do so by the European Powers.

England had her own little plans regarding Egypt, and the sovereignty of the Khedive meant a permanent occupation, and a quasi Protectorate over the country.

England, however, still felt uneasiness regarding her ally of 1827 and 1840, and by way of obviating any evil consequences which might result from the treaty of Unkiar Skelessi, she induced the Powers to sign a Convention, by which it was agreed that no foreign fleets should enter the Straits in time of peace, and the Sultan promised to do his utmost to exclude them, if they should attempt to do so, in violation of this Convention of 1841.

Towards the close of his long and prosperous reign, the Czar Nicholas was destined to pay the penalty of

too much good fortune. The moral ascendancy he had exercised in Europe, during a quarter of a century, the armed intervention, by which he had saved Austria and Denmark from dismemberment, and his undisguised disapprobation of revolutionary France, never satisfied with her rulers, had given umbrage, and excited jealousies in many quarters, so that when the Crimean War broke out, the Russians stood alone, without an ally, in their hour of greatest need. This explains to some extent, though it by no means justifies, the attitude of the Powers, in 1853.

The slight put upon the Greek Church, the pre-eminence given to the Latin, "the Question of the Shrines," in short, was a very insignificant matter in itself, a mere tempest in a teapot, raised by Louis Napoleon, who had just made himself Emperor of the French by an infamous *coup d'état*, (1852) and felt, like all parvenus, an urgent need to dazzle men's eyes, so as to conceal, from their view, antecedents, that it would be desirous to have ignored. The Question of the Shrines, which a witty Frenchman called "*une querelle de sacristain*," because a key and a star were involved, had arisen from the shuffling policy of the Turks, who, in 1740, had accorded certain privileges to the Latin Church protected by France, but had virtually cancelled them, later on, by more important concessions made to the Greek Church at Russia's demand. France having drifted into Voltairianism, made no demur, and allowed this state of things to go on for nearly a century, when it occurred to Louis Napoleon that he might ingratiate himself with newly revived Catholi-

cism in France, by making a stir of zeal in the Holy Land. When the question of the Shrines, or Holy Places of Jerusalem was settled, he was bound to keep the ball rolling, and must needs cast about for some other means of fixing on himself the admiring gaze of Europe. This unfortunate need it was that led to the Crimean War, the Italian Wars, the Invasion of Mexico during the American Civil War, and, finally, to his own defeat and overthrow at Sedan.

Though the Question of the Shrines was a small matter, there were other circumstances that indicated, on the part of the Ottomans, a disposition to evade the treaties made with Russia regarding the Christian subjects of their Empire. As the eminent historian of the "Créméan War," (9 volumes) is undoubtedly a standard authority on this subject, and cannot be suspected of Russophilism, I have endeavored in this chapter to confine myself to statements that are to be found in his voluminous work. It is only in the collation and juxtaposing of the facts, and in my inferences and conclusions, that I differ from Mr. Kinglake, and I think my readers will agree with me, when I shall have laid before them the facts and concomitant circumstances.

The misapprehension, which exists in the minds of many intelligent people, regarding the causes of important wars that have taken place in our own day, is a curious phenomenon. It is generally supposed, for instance, that the abolition of slavery was the determining cause of the American Civil War, whereas it was only an incident. Notions regarding the Crimean War are, in general, even more vague and inaccurate. "By what malign combination of circumstances was

“Turkey endowed with power to work this immeasurable evil? How did it come that this despicable Government was able to make enlightened and powerful Christian States the ministers of its fanatical and barbarous hatred?” These are the questions I will endeavor to answer with all fairness and clearness.

“About this time,” says Kinglake, “it happened that there were troubles in one of the Provinces, and Omar Pacha, at the head of a Turkish force, was operating against the Christians of Montenegro.” (P. 75, vol. I., “Crimean War.”)

We will not enquire too closely into the nature of these “troubles,” too frequent, alas, among these unfortunate Christians, of whom the same author says, in the euphonious language of Turcophilism, “they were not safe from lawless acts of tyranny, and there were usages that reminded them (after four centuries, reader,) that they were a conquered people.” Nor will we examine the character of these “operations,” of Omar Pacha against them, but we will glean in another field, more motives that justified the Czar Nicholas in demanding from the Porte a confirmation of the treaties that had conferred on Russia the Protectorate of the Christians in the Ottoman Empire. To enable my readers to do this. I will simply lay before them a letter from Lord Raglan, commander-in-chief of the British forces, in the Crimean War, as it will also throw a side light on the “troubles” and the “operations” above mentioned. For Turkish policy regarding Christians is always the same, has always been the same, will always be the same, as long as Turks are Turks, and Christians are Christians.

Lord Raglan to the Duke of Newcastle, Secretary of State for War.

VARNA, 8th August, 1854, Bulgaria.

MY LORD DUKE.—The way in which the Christian
“ population is treated by the Turks in Bulgaria, has
“ come so prominently under the notice of her Majes-
“ ty’s officers since the army has been stationed in this
“ neighborhood, that I think it my duty to bring the
“ subject under the official notice of your Grace, and,
“ with this view, I lay before you copies of three des-
“ patches which I have found it necessary to send to
“ the Ambassador ; the two first containing represen-
“ tations of atrocities committed in the vicinity of his
“ camp, by Lieutenant-General Sir de Lacy Evans,
“ and the last forwarding a letter from the Duke of
“ Cambridge, with a detailed report of the Assistant
“ Adjutant-General, Honorable Alexander Gordon,
“ who was directed by H. R. H. to ascertain, with the
“ assistance of an interpreter, how it arose that the
“ Bulgarian peasants manifest such reluctance to bring
“ supplies to our camps. The reason is now obvious.
“ These unfortunate people dare not appear there.
“ They are liable to be robbed on their return home,
“ and to be ill-used as soon as it is known that they
“ are in possession of money ; and they are fortunate
“ if they are not carried off, and, if not ransomed at
“ the price demanded, murdered, as the accompany-
“ ing papers show to have been the case in more than
“ one instance. Hence it is that the Christian inhabi-
“ tants of this Province, hail any change as preferable
“ to the yoke under which they are now being crushed;

“and it may be relied on, that as long as the Turks
 “are allowed to load themselves with arms, and the
 “Bulgarians are not permitted to carry any, the exist-
 “ence of the latter will be, (to use the language of
 “Colonel Gordon,) little better than that of slaves.”

“The treatment of these poor creatures has excited
 “a most painful impression in the army under my
 “command.”

The Duke of Newcastle, one of the chief abettors
 of the Crimean War, replied thus :

“I quite agree with you that we cannot permit such
 “atrocities to be committed under the eyes of the
 “troops we have sent to protect the perpetrators from
 “foreign aggression, and that we must not merely
 “resort to strenuous remonstrance, but to something
 “stronger, if necessary.”

Alas, for British cant! Lord Raglan, in spite of
 his better judgment as a soldier, and his better feelings
 as a Christian, was even then under stringent orders
 of the Duke, Secretary of War, to invade the Crimea
 without delay.

If further proof be needed to show that there were
 just grounds for Russia's demand, I refer to the in-
 structions given to Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, when
 he was sent back to Constantinople, after an absence
 of eight months, (April, 1853.)

The Ambassador was directed “to warn the Porte
 “that the accumulated grievances of foreign nations
 “which the Porte is unable or unwilling to redress,
 “the maladministration of its own affairs * * *
 “may lead to a general revolt among the Christian
 “subjects of the Porte, * * * that perseverance

“ in his (Sultan’s) present conduct, must end in alienating the sympathies of the British nation, and make it impossible for Her Majesty’s government to overlook the exigencies of Christendom, exposed to the natural consequences of their unwise policy and reckless maladministration.” (Crimean War, p. 125, I.)

In the spring of 1853, Prince Menchikoff was sent to Constantinople. Firstly, to negotiate on the Question of the Shrines, which question was amicably settled with Russia’s acquiescence, France retaining the key and star, that were the principal bones of contention. Secondly, to exact from the Porte a Note, confirming the treaties, that had conferred on Russia, the Protectorate of the Christians of the Ottoman Empire.

“ Russia,” says Kinglake, “ availed herself of some loose words that had crept into the treaty of Kainardji, as a ground for maintaining that a moral claim was converted into a distinct right by treaty engagement.” (P. 115, vol. I.) But these “ *loose words*,” as he is pleased to call them, were nailed down at Ackerman and at Adrianople, and implicitly contained in every treaty between Russia and Turkey, as we have already seen in a previous chapter. Moreover, Mr. Kinglake himself informs us later on, after the Russians had evacuated the Danubian Principalities, that “ by the mere act of declaring war against the Czar, the Porte freed itself from the *obnoxious treaties*, which heretofore entangled its freedom.” P. 221, v. II.

What “ *obnoxious treaties* ” if not the very treaties referred to? And why “ *obnoxious*,” but because

they contain these very provisions of which Russia demanded a confirmation, the refusal of which had caused her to occupy the Principalities? If it were otherwise, how could the war declared by the Porte on account of this occupation have freed the Turks from these "obnoxious treaties"?

Mr. Gladstone's argument in justification of Russia's pretensions is unassailable. In 1774 Russia had completely defeated Turkey in a war, which the latter had undertaken against her, at the instigation of the Duke de Choiseul. She had conquered the Crimea, Bessarabia, Wallachia, Moldavia, some of the Ionian Isles, part of Bulgaria and was at the gates of Constantinople, when the Sultan sued for peace, which was concluded at Kairnadji. The protection of the Christian religion was distinctly stipulated for, in this treaty. Some years later the Turks, unfaithful to their engagements, were again defeated by Russia and sued for peace, which was concluded at Adrianople, with the same stipulation regarding the Christians.

Now, if in these conditions, a State enters into a treaty engagement with another State, that it will do a certain thing, clearly that State has a right of reclamation, if the thing be not done.

Therefore, argues Gladstone, as the Sultan made a special treaty regarding the Christians, he gave, in the very nature of things, a special right to intervene, if the promises were not fulfilled.

Let us suppose for a moment, that China had declared war against England and been completely defeated, and that England had consented to conclude a Peace, on condition that the Chinese Government

should guarantee to all Christians, in the Celestial Empire, the free exercise of their religion, and the enjoyment of all civil and religious rights.

Would England, I ask, be justified in intervening, if they were deprived of these rights? Would she be entitled to "protect" them in fact?

Russophobists seem to be somewhat like monomaniacs, who are perfectly sane and rational on every point, except one. Clear sighted, consistent, and impartial, in general, their minds seem to become suddenly warped, as soon as they are focused on Russia.

Nothing short of Russophobia, I am sure, could trouble Mr. Kinglake's serene judgment, and even betray him into paradoxes. After having described, in his own masterly way, the various agencies that worked together to bring about the Crimean War, he sums up thus: "Nicholas was not single minded, and therefore his will was unstable, and since he was armed with the whole authority of his Empire, it seemed plain that it was this man and only he, who was bringing danger from the North," (Ch. XI, Vol. II). This is hardly a fair conclusion. Moreover, if Nicholas was anything, he was single minded and firm, even to obstinacy. He might well be accused of being quixotically conservative in his views, of being blindly, fanatically devoted to the interests of his Church and his co-religionists, but it must also be admitted, that from his frankly avowed policy on these points, he never swerved. How then can it be said that he was "not single minded, and that his will was unstable?"

Elsewhere Mr. Kinglake says: "From head to foot "a vast empire was *made* to throb with the passions

which rent the bosom of the one man, Nicholas," (124 vol. II.) But the historian soon finds that "in the "Tzar a vast people was incarnate, his ambition, his "piety, his anger were in a sense the passions of the "devoted millions of whom he was indeed the true "chief," (p. 127 vol. II.), they were no doubt "*made* to throb," much in the same way as "means for transporting the army were *wrung* from the hapless "peasants," as he informs us elsewhere!

Mr. Kinglake also accuses the Tzar Nicholas of "yielding to an instinct of wild cunning," because when he expressed himself satisfied with the settlement of the "Question of the Shrines," he did not see fit to take the world into his confidence, regarding his intention of exacting a new, and formal recognition of his right of Protectorate over the Christian subjects of the Porte.

Where the instinct of wild cunning comes into play, I fail to see, for, as Mr. Kinglake says "Nicholas "must have known that the matter would be made "public before three weeks." Is it an inexorable law that diplomats shall lay bare in advance, their unmatured projects, under pain of having "their reputation "for honor and good faith, suddenly and forever destroyed?" (p. 109, vol. I.)

The fact is that Mr. Kinglake, like many others, is convinced that the Crimean War was altogether unjustifiable, and he takes every opportunity of slurring the Tzar Nicholas, by way of removing some of the blame from his own countrymen. "What Nicholas seems to "have been in 1853, says the historian, was a firm, right-eous man, too brave and too proud to be capable of de-

“scending to falsehood” (p. 68, vol. I.) But by some imperceptible decline, the Czar seems to have abdicated his high qualities and descended to the level of a wild Tzigane, (Slav Gypsy) and even lower still. How, when, and where, the evil descent was made, does not clearly appear, in spite of Mr. Kinglake’s pellucid style. None of the Czar’s words, or actions are inconsistent with his high moral standing in Europe, or unworthy of a great ruler. With the tossings of his spirit and the upheavings of his passions, of which, Mr. Kinglake seems to have had such a vivid intuition, we have nothing to do; they are not of the domain of history, and moreover, blackening others will never whiten ourselves.

With far greater appearance of justice, might the English Government be accused of having acted with ensnaring duplicity, towards the Czar. Not only did the Prime Minister, Lord Aberdeen, assure the world, that “except for a weighty and solemn cause, no war would be undertaken,” but when the Secretary of State, Lord Clarendon, intimated to the Russian Ambassador that England would resent the occupation of the Danubian Principalities, the Premier insisted on having these words retracted, officially. Could anything be more misleading?

It is not, however, with the personal opinions of the eminent historian that we have to do, but with the unanimous judgment of Europe. When the Powers framed the document, known as the “Vienna Note,” and urged its acceptance on the Porte, they practically acknowledged the justice of the Czar’s demand, and signed their own condemnation in the war that ensued.

For this Note was substantially the same, as the one proposed by Prince Menchikoff, which was made a *casus belli*.

Nicholas readily accepted the arbitration of the Powers, and the affair seemed settled, for the all-powerful English Ambassador had received instructions to bring his whole influence to bear upon the Turks, and to impress them with "the strong and earnest manner in which the Vienna Note was recommended to the acceptance of the Porte, not only by her Majesty's Government, but also by the Cabinets of Austria, France and Prussia." (P. 374, Vol. I.) But the Powers reckoned without their host. Lord Stratford de Redcliffe was bitterly opposed to the Vienna Note, which did not tally with his own little policy in regard to Turkish government, which he was, virtually, administering. The opportunity now afforded for exercising his diplomating prowess, and indulging his love of power was too tempting to be thrown away. Had he not, moreover, a little account to square with the Czar Nicholas, who had refused to receive him as England's representative at St. Petersburg.

Lord Stratford read his instructions to the Ottoman Cabinet with most perfunctory obedience, his whole demeanor the while urging them to reject the "Vienna Note." And it was to his unspoken orders only, that they gave heed. For his ascendancy was great, and he had informed them lately, with much circumstance, and in his most impressive manner, that the British fleet in Besica Bay was at his command. This was enough for these Moslems, who crouch and cringe be-

fore force of any kind, but become singularly bold and daring, as soon as they find themselves sustained by any one, who has the moral stamina, in which they are so lacking, when left to themselves. But for English leadership they would have fled from many a battlefield; and, but for Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, the cause of peace might have triumphed at this hour.

Not only did the English Ambassador succeed in bringing the courage and firmness of the Turks to concert pitch, but also "in presenting them to Europe "in an attitude of Christian forbearance, sustained by "unfailing courage, so that in proportion as men loved "justice and were led by the gentle precepts of the "Gospel, they inclined to the Prince who seemed to "represent these principles." (P. 183, Vol. I.) What a bitter irony these words appear, when read side by side with Lord Raglan's letter, quoted at the beginning of this chapter. Worst of all, the Ambassador inveigled England into a sort of defensive alliance with Turkey, by obtaining separate sanctions to a series of artfully moderate and judicious despatches.

On the 20th August, 1853, much to the surprise of Europe, the Porte declared its refusal to accept the Vienna Note, without making certain alterations, which the Czar, of course, refused to admit.

The alterations were these :

"*Vienna Note.*" "The government of his Majesty, the Sultan, will remain faithful to the letter and to the spirit of the Treaties of the Kainardji and Adrianople, regarding the protection of the Christian Church."

"*Corrections made by the Porte.*" "The government

of his Majesty, the Sultan, will remain faithful to the stipulations of the Treaty of Kainardji, confirmed by that of Adrianople, regarding the protection, *by the Sublime Porte*, of the Christian religion."

The treaties, as we have seen, placed the Christians under the protection of the Czar of all the Russias, the natural head of the Greco-Russo Church since the fall of Constantinople 1453. And, by the altered form, the Christians of the Ottoman Empire were placed under the protection of the Turks. In other words, the wolf solemnly engaged to protect the lambs for himself, and the world knows full well what this kind of protection means, even without the practical demonstrations, furnished by the Turks themselves, over and over again.

Russia, as may well be supposed, refused to accept these alterations, and she continued to occupy the Danubian Principalities, as a "material guarantee," though she declared, at the same time, her unwillingness to go to war, if there were any other means of bringing the Turks to accede to her demand. Moreover, this occupation of Moldavia and Wallachia could not be considered an invasion of the Ottoman territory, nor a *casus belli*, *per se*, for these provinces were autonomous under Russian protection since the Treaty of Bucharest, and, according to this treaty, the Turks had no right to send troops into these provinces.

In September, 1853, some thirty Mudiris (Moslem theological students) presented a petition to the Sultan, urging him to declare war against Russia, and the Ottoman Ministers used the circumstance, with crafty skill, to persuade the French Ambassador, de la Cour,

that his countrymen and co-religionists were in imminent danger from Moslem riots. While, to Lord Stratford, they loudly bewailed over the threatened dissolution of the Ottoman Empire. The English Ambassador was not very much alarmed; it is even probable that the "serious and impressive terms," in which he said the petition was couched, were of his own suggestion, and that he was the "*deus ex machina*" of the whole *mise en scene*.

Before the rejection of the "Vienna Note," and while the Powers were still deliberating in concert, Louis Napoleon had craftily succeeded in drawing England into a special alliance with France; and, now, on receipt of some incoherent, hysterical despatch from his Ambassador, the French Emperor insisted with the English Cabinet, that it was "*indispensably necessary*" that their combined fleets should, in violation of the Convention of 1841, enter the Straits before there had been a declaration of war on any side. "*Aussitôt pris, aussitôt pendu.*" That very day, without any information from the English Ambassador, Lord Clarendon telegraphed to Lord Stratford: "Your Excellency is instructed to send for the British fleet to Constantinople."

Could anything be more ridiculous, more un-English than this undignified precipitation? A handful of Moslems, under the guidance of a strong, self-willed, ambitious Saxon, scare the French Ambassador, who tries to scare his master, who is not scared, but avails himself of the scare, to fool the English Cabinet into a most undiplomatic and unworthy breach of treaty. Certainly, of all the follies induced by Rus-

sophobia, "this bears the palm." The English were fast "drifting" into what Count Nesselrode declared would be, on their part, "the most unjustifiable and "the most unintelligible of wars."

If the Allies had only waited twenty-four hours, they might at least have spared themselves the damnation of driving through an international treaty, without the shadow of a pretext; for, on the 23d October, 1853, the fifteen days expired, that had been allowed by the Sultan's ultimatum for the evacuation of the Principalities, and hostilities had begun between Russia and Turkey.

The Ottomans attacked Russia at Fort St. Nicholas, on the Black Sea, in Armenia, and on the Danube. On the 30th November the Russian fleet sallied forth from Sebastopol, and destroyed the Turkish fleet at Sinope, on the north coast of Asia Minor, under the very eyes, so to say, of the Allies, who had been in such a hurry to enter the Straits, without knowing exactly what they meant to do next.

Total lack of information of current events in the East, or garbled versions of them, betrayed the English people into a firm belief, that the Russians had been guilty at Sinope, of a dastardly act of treachery and surprise. Kinglake, however, who cannot overcome his native love of truth, frankly and completely exonerates the Russians from any such charge.

Even Mr. Justin McCarthy admits that "the "attack was not treacherous, but openly made; "not sudden, but clearly announced by previous "acts, and long expected by the Turkish commander "himself; and it was not in breach even of the

"courtesies of war." p. 469. "A history of our own times."

Yet this so-called "Massacre of Sinope" raised a clamor against the Czar Nicholas, as if he were "a monster outside the pale of civilized law, like some of the furious and treacherous despots of Mediæval Asiatic history." It was subsequently referred to in the declaration of war, that was alleged to have been undertaken to save Europe from the "preponderance of a power that had *defied the opinion of the civilized world.*"

British passions were now stirred, and the government added fuel to the flame, by revealing, at this critical moment, the strictly confidential and personal communications, that had passed in 1852, between Nicholas and the English Prime Minister, regarding the disposal of the "sick man's" heritage, in case of a casualty; communications which, to use the Czar's expression, were to be considered entirely "between gentlemen;" and were, after all, of the same nature as those made in 1844, during Nicholas' visit to Queen Victoria, when the understanding between the two nations seemed to be perfect.

Fired with admiration for the high qualities evinced by the "gentleman Turk," so well schooled by Lord Stratford, and enthusiastic over the skillful manœuvring of Omar Pacha, on the Danube, the English burned to avenge an imaginary wrong, and as the true culprit was not manifest, their vengeance must needs be wreaked on the devoted head of the Czar Nicholas.

Moreover, it must be remembered that since thirty-

eight years Europe had been at peace. The English had "beaten their swords into plough-shares, and their spears into pruning-hooks," and were reposing on laurels won from the past. The "Peace Party," with Cobden and Bright in the van, had preached their wise philosophy to the verge of folly, to the *reductio ad absurdum*—and according to natural laws, the public mind was all prepared to fly off in a tangent, when the tempter again drew near, with his insidious counsels—*behests* rather.

"To prevent the recurrence of a disaster like that of Sinope," said Louis Napoleon, "the allied fleets must take possession of the Black Sea, and the Russian fleet must be pent up in the harbor of Sebastapol, like the malefactor that it was."

And again, the English Government fell into the snare; again, they obeyed the behests of the parvenu French Emperor. (January, 1854.)

As late as August 26th, 1853, Lord Clarendon, alluding to the Vienna Note, had expressed himself thus: "We are bound to make the Turks agree to 'the terms we have prescribed, or let them take their 'course.'" And even at the end of December, 1853, negotiations for the "Vienna Note" were still pending. But now, after destroying the last hope of a peaceable settlement between Turkey and Russia, it occurred to Louis Napoleon that by appeasing the tempest he had himself raised, he might place himself on a pedestal, quite as effectually, as by an offensive alliance with England. And provided he succeeded in making himself conspicuous, the means were of small account with him.

Accordingly, he wrote a well penned, patronizing sort of letter, proffering services and counsel to the proud Czar, who had refused even to address him as a "brother sovereign."

Both counsels and services were scornfully rejected, with an intimation, that if Russia were compelled to fight, she could, probably, hold her own in 1854, as in 1812.

This allusion to the disastrous retreat of Napoleon Bonaparte from Moscow was too much for the plebian French Emperor, who now had a new incentive for dragging England into an aggressive war with Russia.

On the 27th of March, 1854, France and England declared war against the Czar, and began transporting their armies to the banks of the Danube, to obtain the redress of a grievance, which regarded no one but Turkey, and perhaps Austria, who might, as a neighbor, object to the occupation of the Principalities by Russia.

By this occupation, which began several months before the Ottoman declaration of war, (Oct. 1853,) the Russians had placed themselves at a great disadvantage. For the Danube, which was to them a self imposed barrier, between their army and the Ottoman territory, was no barrier for unscrupulous Turks, who, by treaty, were debarred from sending troops into the Principalities. While therefore, the Russian army was becoming demoralized, by a prolonged and anomalous state of inaction, Omar Pacha was, warily and skilfully, taking up strong positions on either side of the Danube, and hemming them in.

In July, 1854, the Russians were forced to raise the

siege of Silistria. They were also defeated at Giurgevo, and retreated from Moldavia and Wallachia. And, as the occupation of these Principalities had been made the *casus belli* of the hostile declarations of France and England, as well as of Turkey, the allies now found themselves, suddenly, and unexpectedly, *sans coup férir*, in the position of champions without a cause.

Already in March, (1854,) when the English Government had resolved to go to war with Russia, it was necessary that the Royal Speech should announce the fact to Parliament. But the "Queen's advocate" declared that upon the papers supplied to him, he "could not frame a proper declaration of war," (P. 120, Vol. II, Crimean War.) However, as Kinglake remarks, "a war could not be stayed for mere want of words." The Queen was advised to say "that she felt compelled to take up arms for the defence of the Sultan, and the independence and integrity of his Empire, for the cause of right against injustice, to save Europe from the preponderance of a Power who had violated the faith of treaties, and defied the opinion of the civilized world."

After the evacuation of the Principalities, the argument for an aggressive war became still more untenable than before. The Empire, whose "integrity and independence" were said to be threatened, had abundantly shown, that it was quite able to fight its own battles. The power, unjustly accused of violating treaties, was not exactly preponderating, having been twice defeated and forced to retreat; and, in fact, it was clear, that the Sultan really needed no defending at all, for the present, at least.

But, when the deadly shaft has left the quiver, and is winging its way through space, it cannot easily be recalled. Mr. Cobden came to the prudent conclusion, that when war is once in the air, the Peace Party might just as well suspend operations, *pro tem.*; for, at such times, the "people are no better than mad dogs."

On the 29th of June, 1854, the Duke of Newcastle, Secretary of State for war, proposed to the Cabinet, that the Allies should invade the Crimea and demolish Sebastopol, in order to make assurance doubly sure, and provide against any future misuse of her power by Russia; leaving it, however, to the discretion of Lord Raglan, to determine on the advisability, of such an undertaking. But this important condition was omitted by the Duke in his Despatch to the Commander-in-Chief, which, on the contrary, was couched in terms, so preremptory, that it left Lord Raglan no alternative, but to obey implicitly, and without delay.

Some days later, the Duke of Newcastle read his Despatch to the assembled Cabinet for their final approval, and, it is a matter of history, that they all slumbered and slept, more or less profoundly, during the entire reading. "A falling chair, says Kinglake, "at one moment interrupted the repose of the Government," which was, however, resumed with the reading of the Despatch, and, at the close of the same, all these fifteen wise, judicious, upright Fathers of the Nation, gave a somnolent assentment to a deadly document, to which they would certainly not have given an unqualified approval, in their more wakeful moments.

Which, it may be inquired here, is more fatal to the peace of nations, the power of an autocrat, who can ring a bell and give the order to declare war, or a dozing cabinet, consenting, unreservedly, to a most unjustifiable invasion of a neighboring Kingdom?

"It would indeed have been better," writes Justin McCarthy, "if the most wearied statesman had contrived to pay a full attention to it, (the Despatch,) but the want of such respect in no wise affected the policy of the country. It is a pity to have to spoil so amusing a story as Mr. Kinglake's; but the common-place truth has to be told that the invasion of the Crimea was not due to the crotchet of one minister and the drowsiness of all the rest." Nevertheless, Mr. McCarthy does not deny the fact, that in the despatch to which the slumbering Cabinet assented, the important provision was omitted, that left the invasion to the discretion of Lord Raglan. He admits that neither the French nor the English commander-in-chief approved of it, and that the invasion of the Crimea was undertaken by Lord Raglan only out "of deference to his Government, and because he did not see his way to decline the responsibility of it." (Vol. I, pp. 487 and 488, "A history of our own times.") It would have been better, far, if even at this hour the Allies had given heed to Lord Raglan's pathetic appeal on behalf of the Bulgarian Christians, and devoted themselves to the task of redressing the wrongs of these unfortunate Christians, instead of attacking their secular champions. Millions of lives would have been spared, and the hideous massacres of Crete and Bulgaria might, perhaps, have been averted.

But no, it was, "Cry havoc, and let slip the dogs of war."

During all this time, Gladstone was Chancellor of the Exchequer, and continued to hold office, though he was an earnest lover of peace and justice. Like Saul of old, he "was consenting unto the death of Stephen," by holding the clothes of those who stoned the martyrs; and, like the Apostle, too, he will feel bitter remorse in 1876 for the part he had taken in an evil work.

Had England so soon forgotten, that in 1805, when Austria and Prussia were prostrate at the feet of Napoleon Bonaparte, it was alliance with Russia that saved her coasts from invasion? That it was Russia's heroic resistance in 1812, which, in destroying the Grand Army, broke the backbone of the Colossus, and prepared an easy triumph for England, two years later, at Waterloo?

Russia and Austria strongly disapproved of the invasion of the Crimea, but still they would not make any alliance with Russia. Grateful young Greece was intimidated into neutrality, when, in her little way, she would gladly have helped her powerful champion of 1827. And thus, Russia stood alone, to resist the aggression of the combined armies and fleets of England, France, Sardinia and Turkey.

The conduct of the English, on whose friendly neutrality, at least, Nicholas had been led to rely, and the defeat of his troops on the Danube, were severe trials for Nicholas; but "the most unkindest cut of all," was the defection of the young Emperor of Austria, whose throne he had saved in 1848, and whom

he loved as a son. "Then mighty Cæsar's spirit broke."

When he learned that Franz Joseph, too, had gone against him, it is said that the Czar, after ordering a statue of the Emperor, that always accompanied him, to be removed from his presence, bent his head, covered his face with his hands and was wrung with grief. "Ambition should be made of sterner stuff."

It was but the first throe of the long agony, that was only to end in the Czar's death, to which allusion has been made elsewhere.

About the same time that the Duke of Newcastle's despatch reached the Camp of the Allies at Varna, (Bulgaria,) the French commander-in-chief received from his government a telegram in cipher, the full purport of which could not be gathered.

It seemed, however, to be in the same sense as the despatch received by Lord Raglan. And thus, on the authority of an obscure telegram, and by the consent of a somnolent cabinet, to a despatch they had not listened to, the British commander-in-chief was compelled to perpetrate a most unjustifiable invasion, as repugnant to his conscience as a Christian, as it was contrary to his military prudence.

At the beginning of this war, Nicholas solemnly declared to the Powers of Europe, "that the sole aim of his endeavors was to assure the rights of his co-religionists, and to protect them from every form of oppression."

"A stranger to selfish designs, he had no thought that his righteous demands would lead to the horrors of war." (Manifesto of Alexander II.)

It is not my purpose to trace the events of this short and bloody struggle, which are still fresh in the memory of many, to whose hearths it brought death and desolation, though the causes that led to it are not equally well known to the general public. It is vaguely believed that the Russians had been guilty of something very wicked at Sinope ; that they had violated some treaties, and were bull-dozing the helpless, inoffensive Turks. A minute and most graphic account of these terrible campaigns, is to be found in Kinglake's Work.

As England had drifted into this war under the leadership of Louis Napoleon, so she now allowed herself to be towed into peace by him.

The French Emperor had theatrical instincts ; he delighted in dramatic effects, and arranged that the curtain should fall, just when his troops had achieved a brilliant success, and the English had been repulsed from the Redan. At the very time when her army was recovering from reverses and losses inflicted by improvident mal administration, and was prepared to carry everything before it, England was forced to accept peace, for which France was even more anxious than Russia herself. Napoleon the Third had achieved what the First Napoleon would have given his right hand to have accomplished.

Not only had he succeeded in making himself received into the society of European Sovereigns, but he had made England his tool, as well as his ally. The honors of victory he claimed for his own, the discredit, the losses, the animosity of the conquered, he apportioned to his ally.

In 1856 the Treaty of Paris put an end to this disgraceful and bootless war. The work of two centuries was undone for Russia. She lost the Black Sea and the protectorate of the Christians of the Ottoman Empire, that she had wrung from the Porte by a succession of victorious campaigns. Instead of a powerful champion whom they lost, these poor Christians were endowed with a "Firman," or "hati-humayoum," by which the Sultan renewed all his lying engagements. And, lest any of the signatory Powers should, in the future, feel entitled to hold him to them, it was distinctly specified that no right of interference was given to any of the Powers by this concession, which was said to "emanate spontaneously, from his sovereign will." The most important clause of this treaty was the "Black Sea clause," by which Russia was deprived of the right to have any navy in these waters, or forts or arsenals on her southern coast.

The Treaty of Paris, which seemed for a moment to have sounded the knell of Russia's existence as a first-rate power, was, in reality, only so much waste paper. Before the ink was well dried, she was already preparing to arise out of her ashes, younger, stronger and greater than before.

In 1870, during the Prussian war, Russia peremptorily demanded the abrogation of this most obnoxious clause, which excluded her navy from the Black Sea. Lord Granville remonstrated on principles of high morality. But, considering that most of the other stipulations made by the Treaty of Paris had been cast to the winds, and in view of the seizure of the Papal States by Victor Emmamel, and of the French Prov-

inces by Prussia, it could hardly be expected that Russia would be so quixotic, as not to avail herself of the present opportunity to shake off a restriction, most obnoxious to herself, and about which the other Powers of Europe cared not one straw. Prince Bismarck devised a means for making of necessity a virtue. At his suggestion, a conference was held in London, January, 1871, which gravely went through the farce of considering Russia's demand, and acceding to it, *spontaneously!*

All reverence is due to the heroes of the Light Brigade and millions of others, who, at the voice of duty, allowed themselves to be slaughtered for an unholy cause, and perished by thousands, of hunger, and cold, and disease, on the bleak shores of the Crimea. Nevertheless, when time shall have laid the dust of glory, raised by crumbling fortresses and bombarded cities, on the bloody days of Inkerman, Alma, and Sebastopol, humanity will judge more sanely of the brutal facts of the Crimean war. Future generations will stand aghast, at the hideous spectacle of three civilized nations, fighting, side by side, with, and for semi-barbarous Moslems, to crush the noble champions of their fellow Christians and fellow Slavs, compelled to languish, since more than four centuries, beneath the yoke of these savage aliens. Posterity will cry shame to the victors, and glory to the vanquished, who so bravely defended their coasts against fourfold odds.

Nay, we may say that the verdict of posterity has been anticipated; and that the posthumous reprobation of the Crimean war has already begun. There

are not many Englishmen, to-day, who do not hold the very same opinions regarding this war, that made John Bright the most unpopular man in the United Kingdom in 1854, and deprived him of his seat in Parliament.

“For eleven months Sebastopol was held against the allied aggressors ; and in the whole empire, from the shores of the Pacific to the Baltic, one thought, one resolution was dominant, to fulfil duty, to protect the Fatherland at any cost of property and life. Husbandmen who had never left the fields they cultivated, hastened to take up arms for the holy struggle, and were not inferior to experienced warriors in bravery and self-renunciation.” (Manifesto of Alexander II in 1856.)

To use the language of Froude, “the whole power of England and France, supported passively by Austria and actively by Sardinia and Turkey, succeeded, with communications secure and rapid, with every advantage for procuring supplies, in partially conquering a single stronghold. It was a great victory, but it was achieved at a cost, to England alone of eighty millions of money and perhaps fifty thousand lives.” “Indisputably,” he adds, “we have learned to form a better measure of Russia’s strength. At the same time we have been forced to modify, materially, our conceptions of Russian barbarism. When the Tiger was wrecked at Odessa, her crew, it was thought, would be sent to the mines of Siberia, or be sold as slaves. Lieutenant Royer found himself treated as a guest rather than as a conquered enemy, and the English prisoners have given but one account

“of the courtesy with which they were entertained. “The officers who, in the Crimean War and elsewhere, “came in personal contact with Russians, never speak “of them except with regard as gentlemen, and with “respect as soldiers.” (Short Studies, Vol. II, P. 420.)

In spite of the prevailing impression that the Peace of Paris was but a truce, Lord Palmerston announced to England that the terms of the treaty of 1856, were “considered generally satisfactory.”

Certainly as far as the Christians of the Ottoman Empire whose interests had indirectly led to the Crimean War, the provisions of the Treaty of Paris were quite as unsatisfactory as the “careful provision against future misgovernment” announced by Lord Salisbury after the Bulgarian War twenty years later. “The leopard cannot change his spots,” and no amount of Treaties can cure the vices of Turkish misrule.

During the Crimean War, which lasted nearly three years, more than four million lives were sacrificed; not in the cause of freedom; not to redress the wrongs of the oppressed, or to help forward the wheel of progress. No, but to pave the way for the bloody atrocities which in 1876, called forth one long cry of horror and indignation throughout Christendom.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE BULGARIAN WAR.

Since the treaty of Paris, 1856, the condition of the Christians, far from being ameliorated by the "Hati humayoun," became more intolerable from year to year, and many insurrections, at first partial, then simultaneous, broke out in Bosnia and Herzegovina among these unfortunates, who were driven to desperation by the ever-increasing barbarity of their task-masters. An Englishman, named Baker, who had considerable landed "interests" at Salonica, assures us in his work on "Turkey," (p. 172. Henry Holt, 1877,) that there has never been a revolt in Turkey in modern times, without the presence of Russian agents." And we have no reason for doubting the authority of this earnest Turcophil, when he informs us, on the same page, that: "The most wanton and unbridled extravagance reigned at the palace the corruption produced by the foreign loans found its way into every artery of the State and "poisoned the very existence of the country "new loans could only be obtained by promises, "which it was impossible to fulfil, and the promises "were made, repeated, added to, without any intention of carrying them out. Some idea may be formed "of what became of the loans, when, as early as 1858, "the debt incurred by the Civil List in less than six

"months amounted to the sum of £3,000,000,000 sterling. It was only natural that a discontented population should be the result; and we shortly find "signs of rebellion springing up in almost every part "of the country, p. 172. "Turkey" Baker. We see here what use was made of the loans so liberally subscribed in Europe, by England in particular, to enable the Turks to carry out the reforms stipulated for by the treaty of Paris. And I leave the reader to judge for himself, whether the revolts and the massacres, which preluded the Bulgarian war, were not due to other causes than the "presence of Russian agents."

In 1875 the situation was thus reviewed by Gladstone, sincerely penitent for the part he had taken in the Crimean war: "Twenty years ago, he said, "France and England determined to try a great experiment in remodeling the administrative system "of Turkey, with the hope of curing its intolerable "vices and making good its not less intolerable deficiencies. For this purpose, having defended her integrity, they made also her independence secure, and "they devised at Constantinople, the reforms which "were publicly enacted in an imperial Firman or "Hati Humayoum."

"The successes of the Crimean war, purchased with "the aid of Sardinia, by a vast expenditure of French "and English life and treasure, gave to Turkey, for the "first time, perhaps, in her blood-stained history, "twenty years of repose, not disturbed, either by her "self or by any foreign power. The Cretan insurrection imparted a shock to confidence, but it was com-

“posed, and Turkey was again trusted. The insurrections of 1875, much more thoroughly examined, have disclosed the total failure of the Porte to fulfil the engagements, which she had contracted under circumstances peculiarly binding on interest, on honor and on gratitude.”

So totally, indeed, had the Turks failed to keep any of their promises of reform, and so hopeless did the condition of these hapless Christians appear, that they at first refused the mediation of the Powers, declaring that they preferred death to Turkish rule.

“If you are not willing to help us to attain our liberty, they said, at least you cannot compel us to enter into slavery again. We will never fall into the hands of the Turks alive.”

About this time Turkey declared herself under the necessity of partially repudiating her national debt; the interest of which was to be paid, for the next five years, half in gold and half in new five per cent. bonds, the tribute from Egypt and the tobacco revenue being mortgaged as security. Bondholders became alarmed, and the European Powers awoke to the necessity of seeing that the reforms stipulated for, by the Treaty of Paris, were executed. The Balkan provinces are chiefly agricultural, and the Christians, (*raïas*) are the cultivators of the soil. If they were allowed to be exterminated, or if they abandoned the plough for martial weapons, no taxes could be collected, and Turkey would be less and less able to pay her debts.

The Powers, therefore, intervened by the Protocol known as the Andrassy Note, and the Sultan once

more made brilliant promises of reform, which the Powers believed, or again affected to believe. England even tendered to the Sultan the cordial expression of her hopes, "that he would soon succeed in quelling the revolts of his subjects and restoring "order." Let us trust, that she did not foresee how the Bulgarian atrocities would soon realize her "hopes."

Some of the records of her Blue Books, regarding the Eastern Question, will be an everlasting blot on England's escutcheon. Through them all is heard, more or less distinctly, the "jingling of the guinea, that helps the hurt that honor feels." (Locksley Hall.) I will quote only one passage, which is from a letter addressed to Lord Derby, by Sir Henry Elliott, ambassador at Constantinople, September 4, 1876. "We have been upholding what we know to be "a semi-civilized nation, liable under certain circumstances to be carried into fearful excesses : but the "fact of this having just now been strikingly brought "home to all of us (by the Bulgarian massacres) can "not be a sufficient reason for abandoning a policy, "which is the only one that can be followed with a "due regard to our own interests."

Disraeli, (Beaconsfield) like Lord Palmerston, had, or affected to have, absolute faith in the Turks. It was a fixed idea with this party, that the repression of Russia, by any and all means, was a *sine qua non* of the existence of British India, and the only palladium of England's commerce in the East. And as the maintenance of Turkey seemed the only means of preventing Russian expansion, they refused absolutely

to heed any considerations, opposed to a policy shaped entirely by "British interests."

Millions of Christians must, if necessary, be sacrificed to this Moloch, and their cries must be drowned as effectually as possible, so as not to cause a scandal in Europe. All reports of Turkish oppression and Christian disaffection were treated as mere "coffee house babble," invented by Russia for her own wicked ends. Disraeli, an Anglican Jew, could not be expected to feel much interest in the fate of the Balkan Christians; but even Lord Derby's only suggestion to the Porte was that the insurrections must be put down, as promptly and effectually as possible.

Historians and humanitarians, in future ages, will ponder in amazement over the strange moral aberration of a nineteenth century government, supposed to be in the vanguard of Christian civilization.

"O tempora, O mores," they may well exclaim, as they read, how the interests of millions of oppressed Christians, the rights of humanity and justice were laid in the balance with British dollar and cent interests, and found wanting.

Meanwhile the Montenegrins and the Servians joined the insurgents of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the rebellion assumed alarming proportions. "With us," said Milan, of Servia, "are our brave Montenegrin allies, led by their noble chief, Nikita, "with us are those valiant Herzegovonians and those "martyr Bosnians. Our brothers, the Bulgarians, "await our coming, and we hope that the glorious "Hellenes, the descendants of Themistocles and Boz-zaris, will join us ere long. Forward, then, noble

“heroes. Let us march in the name of Almighty God, protector of nations ; let us march in the name of justice, liberty and civilization.”

Thousands of Russians of all ranks hastened to the assistance of their fellow Slavs, without even the formality of seeking the consent of the Czar, or of their local authorities. Foremost among these volunteers, whose chivalrous devotion to a noble cause, convinced this poor old money-making world of ours, that the race of *preux chevaliers* is not yet wholly extinct, was the valiant young Kiréef, of Moscow, whose lofty stature, “all clothed in white,” like Henry of Navarre at Ivry, made him the common target of the Moslems. In his preface to the Crimean War, Mr. Kinglake has admirably related the death of this young hero, which kindled a flame of enthusiasm, that spread like wild fire through the whole length and breadth of Russia, and made the Bulgarian war a necessity for the Government.

In Bulgaria, the arrest of two conspirators, who were rescued by their compatriots from prison, gave rise to an insurrection, (May 1876) and to quell and punish it, an improvised militia of frantic Moslems, (*bashi bazuks*) were let loose upon the Christian villages. Many thousands, (fifteen thousand, according to Schuyler) of innocent victims, mostly women and children, were inhumanly massacred, while many more were dragged to slave markets, and sold for a few liras apiece.

This time England's better nature was fairly roused. There was a veritable “uprising of the English people.” Four hundred public meetings were held in different

parts of the Kingdom to protest against these atrocities ; and, be it said to the glory of the British working classes, the much maligned proletariat, that there were no ingredients of politics and politicians in these essentially popular and spontaneous manifestations of righteous indignation. The diplomats and politicians, the men of wealth and elegant leisure, were all off on summer tours, on pleasure bent.

Great men like John Bright, always the friend of Russia, Gladstone, Freeman, and others, publicly denounced England, as the accomplice of the Turks in their deeds of horror, by the moral and material support she had so freely given them in recent years. My pen refuses to retrace the details of these horrors, and to stigmatize them, I will borrow the eloquent language of the great statesman: "There has been "perpetrated," said Gladstone, "under the authority "of a Government, to which all the time we have "been giving the strongest moral support, and for part "of the time material support, crimes and outrages "so vast in scale, as to exceed all modern examples "and so unutterably vile as well as fierce in character, "that it passes the power of heart to conceive and of "tongue and pen adequately to describe them. These "are the Bulgarian horrors. There is not a criminal "in an European jail ; there is not a cannibal in the "South Sea Islands, whose indignation would not "arise and overboil at the recital of that which has "been done, which has been too late examined, but "which remains unavenged—which has left behind "the fierce passions that produced it, and which may "spring up in another murderous harvest, from the

“soil reeked with blood, and in the air tainted with every imaginable deed of crime and shame. That such things should be once is a damning disgrace to the portion of our race which did them; that a door should be left open for their ever so barely possible repetition would spread that shame over the whole.”

Almost immediately after these horrible massacres, the British fleet anchored in Besica Bay. It was never clearly explained why, but it certainly looked very much as if England were preparing to champion the Turks once again, as she had done in the Crimean war. However this may be, every Englishman's cheek must tingle with shame at the thought, that all lookers-on, the Turks themselves included, took for granted that the presence of this fleet in Turkish waters was a friendly demonstration on the part of the English towards the Sultan, and that they were, in fact, going to help him to restore order among his rebellious subjects. The true facts of the case will probably never be known. The government in England even did their utmost to prevent the real state of affairs in the Balkans from transpiring, and succeeded, for a long time, in keeping the country in the dark.

The Turkish government made some feeble and lying attempts to disavow the Bulgarian atrocities, but, practically, they gave themselves the lie, by publicly rewarding the chief instigators and perpetrators, and disgracing those who had humanely intervened on behalf of unoffending villages.

Fortunately for the true knowledge of the facts, the Government of the United States sent a special com-

mission of inquiry to Bulgaria, and history will owe them a debt of gratitude, for having furnished reliable documents on this matter, in which every European State was more or less exposed to an imputation of bias; whereas, "America, as Mr. Gladstone observed, "had neither alliances with Turkey nor grudges "against her, nor purposes to gain by her destruction. "She entered into this matter simply on the ground "of its broad human character and moment. She had "no "American interests" to tempt her from her integrity and to vitiate her aims."

On the 22nd August, 1876, Mr. Eugene Schuyler reported to the American Government that the outrages of the Turks were fully established. "An "attempt however, has been made, he said, and not by "Turks alone, to defend and to palliate them, on the "ground of the previous atrocities which, it is alleged "were committed by the Bulgarians. I have carefully "investigated this point and am unable to find that the "Bulgarians committed any outrages or atrocities, or "any acts which deserve that name. I have vainly "tried to obtain from the Turkish officials a list of "such outrages. No Turkish women were killed in "cold blood. No Mussulman was tortured. No purely Turkish village was attacked or burned. No "Mussulman house was pillaged. No mosque was desecrated or burned."

Thus, it was through the American Consul and Commissioner, and thanks to the "Daily News" of London, that the English people, who had been kept in the dark and hoodwinked by their own government, were enlightened as to these atrocities. "What can

and should be done, either to punish or to brand, or to prevent?" was the question proposed by Gladstone at this momentous moment? How it was answered the sequel will tell.

About the middle of May, (1876,) Germany, Austria, Russia, France and Italy, agreed to send a threatening note to the Porte, demanding redress and reparation for the Christians, as the Andrassy Note had proved quite ineffectual. England (Lord Derby,) declined her signature, pretending that such peremptory language on the part of the Powers, was "a breach of international courtesy." A few months later, however, the envoyé of the European Powers, England included, assembled at Constantinople and sent a Protocol to the Sultan, much in the same sense as the previous one.

It was rejected by the Turkish government in toto, and all the plenipotentiaries immediately left the city, shaking the dust from their feet, but too righteous to sin against the Treaty of Paris, (1856.) And thus, were these hapless Christians, once again, abandoned to their fate, and to the ruthless vengeance of the Moslems.

It was on this same principle of non-intervention, that, during the massacres in Crete, (1866) the Foreign Secretary, (Lord Derby then Stanley,) inhumanly forbade the English consul, Mr. Dickson, and the naval officers, to aid even helpless women and children to escape from their Turkish hell hounds, by transferring them to Greece. It would have been interfering in the "relations of the Sultan with his subjects," and this the Powers had pledged themselves in 1856, not

to do. Any such interference would have been a breach of courtesy, all the more inadmissible, that the Sultan Abdul Aziz was, at that very moment, being feasted at Windsor, and receiving the adulations of the British public.

Was there ever a more Pharisaical "whitening of sepulchers" and "washing of platters"—a more miserable "straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel?"

The Russians, having traditional and ineluctable duties towards their fellow Slavs, and fellow Christians, did not feel bound by any such Pharisaical scruples, and they were preparing to arm in their defence, as soon as it became clear that the negotiations of the Powers were futile.

In January, 1877, Prince Gortchakoff, sent a Circular to the European Cabinets, calling to their notice, "that after more than a year of diplomatic efforts, the position was the same as at the beginning of the crisis, still further aggravated by the blood that has been shed, the passions that have been stirred, the ruins that have been accumulated. The Porte pays no heed to its engagements. Far from having progressed to a satisfactory solution, the state of the East has grown worse, and remains a permanent menace to the peace of Europe, the sentiments of humanity, and the conscience of Christian nations."

Another Protocol was launched from London, (April, 1877,) and was declared by the Porte to be "destitute of all equity, and of all obligatory character." Lord Derby declared he really did not see what fur-

ther steps the British government could take to avert war. Apparently, he did not think like Mr. Gladstone, "that the time had come for England to emulate Russia, by sharing in her good deeds." Russia, who "had been playing the part," he says, "which the English think especially their own, in resistance to tyranny, in befriending the oppressed, in laboring for the happiness of mankind."

It was, at least, fortunate for Russia and the Balkan Christians, that the Bulgarian atrocities had produced so great a revulsion of popular feeling against the Turks, that even a Disraeli Cabinet did not dare to enter into another monstrous alliance with them against the champions of the Christians. But I am ashamed to say that official neutrality did not prevent the Turks from recruiting many officers in England; and that in spite of it, British guineas and firearms eked out their powers of resistance during the struggle with Russia.

On the 20th of April, 1877, about two weeks after the last Protocol had been declared by the Porte, "to be devoid of all equity," the Czar Alexander the Second proclaimed his Manifesto, announcing the campaign against the Turks.

"Our faithful subjects," he said, "know the lively interest we have always felt in the destinies of the oppressed population of Turkey. Our desire to improve and render their lot secure, is shared by the whole Russian people, who now show themselves ready to offer fresh sacrifices, in order to alleviate the position of the Christians. In concert with the great European Powers, our allies and friends, we

“ have endeavored, by means of pacific negotiations,
“ to effect an improvement in the condition of the
“ Balkan Christians. For two years we have made
“ unceasing efforts to induce the Porte to grant such
“ reforms as would assure the Christians against the
“ arbitrary use of authority by the local magistrates,
“ but the Porte has remained unshaken in its categori-
“ cal refusal of any guarantee for the safety of the
“ Christians. By its refusal, the Porte places us under
“ the necessity of having recourse to arms. We now
“ invoke the blessing of God Almighty on our valiant
“ armies, and we give the order to cross the Turkish
“ frontier.”

It was not too soon. The insurgents had obtained many victories over the Turks, but they could not long have maintained themselves against superior numbers. The wild Bashi-Bazucks were bearing down upon them; and butcheries, more horrible than those of Bulgaria, would undoubtedly have been perpetrated, if the Russians had not intervened at this moment.

The frontier State of Roumania had unhesitatingly placed its rivers, railways, roads, ports and telegraphs at Russia's disposal, and, as might have been expected, the Porte declared war against this Province. The Roumanians replied by a declaration of independence, and placed an army in the field under Prince Charles, to join the Russians.

During the Bulgarian campaigns, which lasted about a year, the Russians were nearly always successful. At Plewna, a strong place that commanded the road to Constantinople, the Turks

fought with all the energy of despair, and the Russians, ill equipped and lacking victuals, were three times repulsed. For nearly seventy hours these brave soldiers subsisted on one day's rations of biscuits, while the nearest water supply was a mile off.

Finally, however, Plewna was taken; and the victorious army advanced to Adrianople. The Russians were within a few hours' march of Constantinople, but they abstained from entering the Sultan's capital. For, at the beginning of the war, Alexander the Second had pledged his word to England, "that he had no intention of acquiring Constantinople, and that if he were forced to occupy a part of Bulgaria, it would only be provisionally, until the peace and security of the Christian populations were secured." But for this promise, and popular feeling in Great Britain, it is quite probable that England would have resumed her role of protecting the Turks, and there would have been a repetition of the Crimean war.

When General Grant said that Russia's abstention from entering Constantinople at this conjuncture was the greatest mistake a nation ever committed, he was either not aware of this secret engagement made with Lord Loftus, the British Ambassador at St. Petersburg, or he considered, with reason, that England's sending her fleet into the Bosphorus was a violation of her engagements of neutrality, which justified Russia in not abiding by her promises.

Evidently the Russians were masters of the situation, and had well earned the right to dictate their own terms, when the Sultan sued for peace. In the Treaty of San Stefano, drawn up by Ignatief, and

acceded to by the Porte, they certainly evinced great moderation and disinterestedness. All that they demanded was the independence of Bulgaria, Servia, Montenegro and Roumania, with extension of territory; the evacuation of certain forts, and the payment of war indemnity.

Traitrous and blood-thirsty in war as in peace, the Turks had, during the Bulgarian campaigns, shamefully violated the rights of humanity, laid down in the Convention of Geneva, and subscribed to by every nation having any pretension to being civilized.

The wounded and the dying left on the battlefield were barbarously mutilated; ambulances and surgeons were brutally fired on while discharging their duties. Altogether, the conduct of the Turks had been such that it might well be supposed that they had, at last, alienated every particle of interest felt in their destinies by European nations.

Perhaps this was so. But the fiction of the "balance of power," that cloak for many iniquities, which has sheltered so much selfishness, so many petty passions, and despicable interests—the "balance of power" must be maintained, said England, and all the Powers answered, Amen!

When the true state of affairs in the Balkans had transpired in England, the tide of popular indignation became so strong, that it seemed for a moment as if Gladstone's plea for the total expulsion of the Turks from Europe would be heard. But it was not long before his "bag and baggage policy," as it was called, and the complete defeat of the Turks again evoked the old phantom. The danger flag, with the legendary "Bear,"

was waved ominously. Troops were ordered to Malta from India, and the leader of the Government Party, Disraeli, declared significantly, "that in a righteous cause England would commence a fight that would not end till right was done." While the speech from the throne announced, that "some unexpected occurrence might render it incumbent to adopt measures of precaution." "The unexpected occurrence" did not happen, for the Russians scrupulously abstained from entering Constantinople, as they had promised.

But after having allowed Russia, single-handed, to monopolize the glory of defending the Christians against their oppressors, England, and the European Powers at her suggestion, now insisted on making the settlement between the belligerents a matter of international diplomacy. To the Treaty of San Stefano they substituted the Congress of Berlin, whose chief aim, apparently, was to give the Sick Man a new lease of life, and afford him more opportunities of exercising his execrable power against his hapless Christian subjects, to say nothing of the pleasure of mortifying their magnanimous champions.

By the Congress of Berlin, Bulgaria was divided into three unequal portions. Bulgaria proper, alone, was to be autonomous under Prince Alexander of Battenberg, a ward of the Teutonic Cabinets. Southern Bulgaria, or Roumelia, was to have a Christian Governor under the control of the Porte; while the country stretching westward to Mount Pindus was given back to the Sultan's accursed rule. In other words, the Bulgaria to whom Russia deeded the precious boon of freedom, at San

Stefano, consisted of 65,560 square miles, with 3,980,000 inhabitants; and the Bulgaria mutilated by the Congress of Berlin, consisted of only 24,404 square miles, and 740,000 inhabitants.

Yes, four million and a half Christians, including the most laborious and intelligent portion of the Bulgarian nation, were handed back like so many dumb, driven cattle, to the tender mercies of the wicked Turks, by so-called Christian and liberal nations.

Indeed, it was the openly averred intention of the Beaconsfield (Disraeli) Cabinet, to maintain to the utmost, "the integrity and the independence of Turkey." It was no fault of theirs, that every one of these unfortunate Christians, who had fought so bravely for their deliverance, was not again cast into the odious bondage from which Russia had rescued them.

International crimes like this, must cry to Heaven for vengeance, and the most powerful and enlightened nation who participated in it, is also the most guilty.

The Berlin Congress furthermore decreed, that Bosnia and Herzegovina were to be occupied by Austria; Russia was to retain Batoum, Kars and Bessarabia. The independence of Servia and Montenegro was recognized. While England, having concluded a secret convention with the Porte, acquired the Island of Cyprus, by way of counsel fees, probably, and no doubt congratulated herself on the good offices she had rendered.

Lord Salisbury thus summed up the situation in 1879. "The Sultan's dominions, he informed the Powers, have been provided with a defensible frontier, far removed from his capital. The interposition

“ of the Austrian power between the two independent
“ Slav States, while it withdraws from him no territory of strategical or financial value, offers him a
“ security against renewed aggression, on their part,
“ which no other possible arrangement could have
“ furnished. Rich and extensive Provinces have been
“ restored to his rule, at the same time that careful
“ provision against future misgovernment has been
“ made, which will, it may be hoped, assure their loyalty and prevent a recurrence of calamities, which
“ have brought the Ottoman power to the verge of
“ ruin. Arrangements of a different kind, having the
“ same end in view, have provided for the Asiatic
“ dominions of the Sultan, security for the present,
“ and hope of prosperity and stability in the future.
“ Whether use will be made of this, probably the last
“ opportunity which has thus been obtained for Turkey, by the interposition of the Powers of Europe,
“ of England, in particular, or whether it is to be
“ thrown away, will depend upon the sincerity with
“ which Turkish statesmen now address themselves to
“ the duties of good government, and the task of
“ reform.”

Does it not appear as though there had been an urgent need to protect the wolf against the lamb? And would not one be tempted to suppose, that the Bulgarian campaigns had been undertaken with the sole and express purpose of assuring the “integrity and independence” of Turkey, to use the consecrated formula of British political cant?

The interference of the Powers by the Berlin Conference, was altogether a most unmitigated imperti-

nence, quite as unjustifiable as if Austria, Germany and Russia had stepped in after the war of the Rebellion, and said to the United States: "You have beaten England with the help of France, and conquered your independence it is true, but we, the Powers, have decided, in European Consistory, that only Massachusetts, New York and Vermont shall henceforth be autonomous. Mexico shall occupy militarily, the country adjoining her territory; the larger States of Ohio, Texas, etc. shall be divided into three unequal portions, one of these shall be restored to British rule, another shall be allowed to elect a governor, subject to England's approval, and the remaining portion only shall be autonomous."

This iniquitous Congress of Berlin has prolonged the always critical condition in the Balkan Peninsula and prevented these nations from getting a fair start.

The unnatural mutilation of Bulgarian Territory and the rule of foreign princes, Alexander and Ferdinand, the Mannikins of Austria and Germany have handicapped this once powerful nation, before whom the Western Cæsars trembled. Worst of all, this Congress has postponed the day of reckoning for the Turk, this miserable, insolent, parasite boarder, who should have been hustled out of Europe long ago.

In Russia the Treaty of Berlin called forth the most indignant disapprobation. It was a scandal to the whole nation, to the Slavophiles in particular. Assakoff the great Panslavist Editor, declared that the Congress was "a colossal absurdity, a blundering failure and an impudent outrage on Russian susceptibilities. "Russian diplomacy he said, was more disastrous than

“nihilism; the nation had been mocked with a fool’s cap and bells and their honor trampled under foot.”

To this day the Congress of Berlin is a bitter subject in Russia. The Czar has steadfastly refused to recognize Ferdinand of Coburg, and his occupancy of the Bulgarian throne is a direct violation of the Treaty of Berlin, which requires that this Province be governed by a Prince, whose nomination shall be accepted by all the Signatory Powers. Only the autocratic will of the Czar holds back the nation from war, and prolongs a precarious reign of peace. At any moment a spark may kindle a flame, which would spread like wild fire, and the pressure brought upon the Government be so great, that resistance may become impossible, as was the case in 1876.

The unjust Treaty of Paris which had been wrung from the vanquished in 1856, was practically cancelled by the Congress of Berlin (1879), and Russia’s attitude towards the Turks, in 1852, was further justified by England’s concluding with the latter, the Anglo Turco Convention. For, this convention gave to England not only the Island of Cyprus, but also a right of protectorate over the Eastern Christians, much the same as that conferred on Russia by the Treaty of Kainardji, the maintaining of which had led to the Crimean war.

Before another decade is over we may see the Treaty of Berlin blotted out, *suo vice*, in the smoke and gore of battle fields. It is impossible that the entire emancipation of the Balkan Peninsula should not be accomplished, for whenever a germ has been deposited, involving the progress of any portion of the

human race, it is bound to develop sooner or later. The days have gone by when the inhabitants of a country could be parcelled out like dumb driven cattle, regardless of natural affinities, and identity of language and creed.

If we could surmount all prejudice, and look above, and beyond the accumulated rubbish that has been written and spoken about the Russian Bear's voracious appetite, we would see that, ever since the fourteenth century, it has been the historic mission of Russian autocracy to deliver the Slavs from the tyranny of the Crescent, and also from themselves. Muscovite autocracy saved the Russian Slavs from the Moslems; and Imperial autocracy, in the person of Peter the Great, rescued them from drifting completely out of the current of European life and civilization, back into the Dead Sea of Asiatic stagnation and barbarism.

Russian blood and Russian treasure have paid the ransom of such of the Balkan Slavs, who now enjoy immunity, more or less complete, from the Moslem yoke. And, never has Poland, the inspiring subject of so much "shrieking," from the days of the poet, Campbell, to our own, enjoyed so much freedom and prosperity, as since she had the good fortune to be annexed to Russia. I do not speak of the Polish aristocracy, but of the people. For in all the conquered provinces, their palmy days were over for the ruling classes, who generally composed two-thirds of the population, the rest being practically serfs.

The Slav family comprises two-thirds of the entire population of Europe; and only when autocracy shall

have fulfilled its historic mission of raising all these Slavonic races, beginning by Russia herself, to the rank of progressive nations, may we look for the decline of this absolute power, which appears, to many, an offensive anachronism. When Russian autocracy shall have accomplished this work, it will probably disappear to make room for a new order of things, bequeathing to history the not unusual task of tardy vindication and justification of what is no more.

CHAPTER XV.

ALEXANDER THE THIRD—CONSOLIDATION OF THE RUSSIAN
EMPIRE.

The reign of Nicholas the First was perhaps as critical a time in Russian history as that of Ivan the Great and Peter the Great. The power of the boyars, or nobles descended from Rurick, had been, to a great extent, crushed by these two rulers. But there remained the minor nobility, many of whom were foreigners, who had either inherited titles or acquired them, and were all serf holders. These still interposed a barrier between the throne and the masses, and from their ranks, chiefly, rose the conspirators of 1825, of 1848, and the nihilists of more recent times.

If the Emperor Nicholas strengthened the bureaucracy and the police, it was not done to repress the people, but to crush their would-be oppressors, who were violently opposed to the projected emancipation of the serfs. The "people of Russia" are not this handful of ambitious malcontents, known at home as "the intelligence," and so widely represented abroad by their literary spokesmen, magazinists and newspaper correspondents. The "people of Russia" comprise two-thirds of the nation, and compose the rural democracies described in a preceding chapter.

The distinction between the alleged "people of Russia," and the true people of Russia, is one that

cannot be too much insisted on. This people of Russia is not craving for constitutions and political liberties, nor for self-government, which they already possess in their "Mirs," in a form which is entirely to their taste: and, where they regulate their own little home affairs without the assistance of any "boss politicians," "rings," and other political machinery. Their only craving is for the full possession of the land they till, a most healthy craving, which all governments would do well to foster and gratify.

The great work of consolidating and homogenizing the nation was begun by Nicholas the First. To him fell the ungrateful task of repressing, with an iron hand, the incipient efforts of the nobility to destroy the only power capable of restraining them from establishing in Russia, as in Poland, the reign of oligarchic anarchy, under cloak of constitutional government.

When autocracy shall have succeeded in crushing out this troublesome intermediate stratum of ambitious malcontents, the levers of civilization will be, more easily and effectively, applied to raise the masses to the plane of a great progressive nation. Only then can bureaucracy, and even autocracy itself, disappear, leaving the people of Russia to work out their own destinies.

Nicholas the First most effectually prepared the way for the emancipation of the serfs by liberating those on his private estates, and by a succession of Ukases, which conferred on all, the right of possessing property—of entering into contracts—of giving evidence in courts of justice. In many instances, too,

when proprietors were ruined, peasant communities were aided, by loans from the Imperial Treasury, to buy the land ; and thus they became, practically, free, as it was not permitted, by law, to buy and sell serfs without the land. This was certainly "something attempted, something begun," that might well have earned, for the "Iron Emperor," some of the meed of praise, so freely bestowed upon his successor, the Czar Liberator.

Full of solicitude and tenderness for his soldiers in the Crimea, and for all around him, holding in his hand to the last, that of his admirable consort, the proud, stern Czar Nicholas, who had presented only his iron mask to his enemies, passed away cheerfully and humbly, in the little vaulted, one windowed room, he had occupied, for thirty years in the Winter Palace, counting for naught the splendors of his official residence. His only regret in dying, was, "that he could not live to bear all that was painful" in the consequences of the Crimean War, instead of his son Alexander the Second, to whom his last words were : "After Russia, I have loved you better than anything "in this world."

The true character of Nicholas is revealed in the remarkable holograph will that he left—and which reads as follows :—

"I thank all those who love and served me. I forgive all who hated me. I ask forgiveness of those whom I have involuntarily offended. I endeavored to correct the bad qualities which I discovered in myself, and I succeeded in some points but not in others. With all my heart I ask forgiveness."

Nicholas the First, was the man of the hour for his country, and posterity will exonerate him from much of the blame, so unjustly heaped upon his memory. Others have entered into his labors, and reaped where he had sown in tears, amid the reprobation and maledictions of his contemporaries, amid the ruins and the dilapidation, that enshrouded the closing years of his long and prosperous reign.

In 1826, it had appeared to all that the throne of the Czars was so completely undermined, that the least concussion of ill success would cause an explosion, in which the whole structure of Church and State would be shattered, for ever. "Russia will fall into a thousand pieces, the common fate of barbarous States," said Grenville Murray, with characteristic national self complacency.

Nevertheless, when Alexander the Second succeeded his father in 1855, after the tremendous reverses of the Crimean War, no throne was more firmly established, both at home and abroad. The death of Nicholas the First, re-instated autocracy in the hearts of all, and restored to the throne the love and fidelity of the whole nation. Never had the coronation of any Czar excited such universal interest, or been more brilliantly attended, than was that of Alexander the Second. The admiration excited by the brave resistance of the Russians during the Crimean War, had enlisted the sympathies of all Europe. And, never, perhaps, in her whole history, had Russia been so much respected and feared, as she began to be, immediately after a most disastrous war, and a still more humiliating peace.

Strange to say, too, the period that followed the death of Nicholas was the dawning of Russia's great day of the "Renaissance"—the tardy awakening of her national genius. This period was to the Northern Empire, what the Elizabethan Era was to England, the Augustan Age to classical literature.

If Peter the Great, may be said to "have knouted Russia into civilization," it might also be said that Nicholas the First knouted Russian literature into existence—by the severe system of literary repression he instituted. During his reign, when every current seemed frozen, every source petrified, intellectual life was acquiring unusual force and fecundity. And, as soon as the reign of "Censorial Terror" ceased, it burst forth into verdure and blossom like the snow-clad bosom of the earth, at the first touch of the vernal equinox.

Melchior deVogué, has admirably described the surprising genesis of a National literature in Russia, that had hitherto produced only copyists and imitators.

In a preceding chapter we have traced the strange divagations of imported liberalism, which followed close upon the important reforms, instituted by Alexander the Third. The human mind seems to be ever ready to go off on a tangent; and, to maintain a just equilibrium, a strong centripetal force is as necessary in the political sphere, as in the sphere of nature.

The night that followed the assassination of Alexander the Second, was a solemn hour in the history of Russia. Her political destinies hung in the balance. The Czar Liberator had arrived at the conclusion, that

constitutional liberties were necessary for Russia's greatest good, and, being a true patriot, he vanquished his personal susceptibilities, laid aside the prejudices born of secular traditions, and, was about to promulgate the Ukase, that was to transform "Holy Russia," from a theocratic autocracy, into a Constitutional Monarchy.

The most natural, and, apparently, the only safe course for the new Czar, was to complete the work of his father, and endow the nation with the legacy bequeathed to them by their murdered sovereign. But Alexander the Third, whose only guiding star is an exalted sense of duty, takes no counsel with expediency, or considerations of personal safety. In the middle of the night he summoned the Counsellors of State, and after many hours of momentous deliberation, his course of action was determined on.

The orders were countermanded that had already been given for the promulgation of the Ukase, which lay on the table of Alexander the Second, awaiting his signature, on the day of his assassination. To the country, where all the demons of anarchy were abroad, with the bombs and steel of a thousand assassins aimed at his breast, Alexander the Third, deliberately and unflinching, pronounced his memorable Manifesto on Autocracy, in which he declared to all parties that it was his firm intention to govern Russia according to her own national traditions only.

It seems quite ludicrous that newspaper correspondents should represent as trembling before the Nihilists, and concealing himself in the recesses of his palace, a sovereign, who showed so much nerve and

courage at such a critical moment. And it is still more pitiful that they should actually find credence with the public. But how should this dear gullible public refuse its adherence to an oft-repeated lie, when Mr. Algernon Swinburne vouches for its truth in an epileptical alliteration, meant for poetry, by which he incites to the assassination of Russia's greatest patriot, to whose home he refers as,

“Halls wherein men's murderers, crowned and cowering,
dwell.”

In the recent railway accident at Borki, half stunned by the shock, Alexander the Third's first impulse was to rush to the assistance of the victims of the catastrophe. The safety of his much loved family was only his second thought, and his personal safety, apparently, never occurred to this timorous Czar, who was singularly endangering his life, if the accident were the work of the Nihilists, as might well be supposed. It was in similar circumstances that the second bomb did its fatal work on the 13th March, 1881. For, if Alexander the Second had not insisted on descending from his carriage to pick up a small boy, wounded by the explosion of the first bomb, he might have driven home safely.

The Extradition Treaty having been, at last, concluded between the United States and Russia, it is probable that these murderous attempts on the Czar's life will become more rare, as these would-be assassins will no longer find an asylum on this side of the Atlantic, where they can pose as persecuted patriots, and regale the public with blood-curdling

tales of autocratic despotism, from which they have fled.

When, on his accession to the throne, Alexander the Third boldly upraised the standard of Autocracy in the face of the Nihilists, and declared to the nation that he intended to govern, according to their own traditions only, and not according to any foreign ideals, he did not mean that his people should, henceforth, vegetate in the shadow of ancient abuses, or slacken their onward march in the least. To the Czar Alexander, autocracy is not merely a supreme dignity, devolved upon him by the accident of birth, but a sublime charge, a sacred burden, imposed by Providence, and fraught with creative potentialities, which it is his high mission to render operative for the public weal, regardless of all personal repugnance for the task.

It is not for a foreigner to decide in a single chapter of a brief essay on Russia, whether, or no, it is to be regretted that the Ukase of a Free Constitution was not promulgated. We are all apt to imagine that the nostrums, which we ourselves have used successfully, must, necessarily, be beneficial to our neighbor, afflicted with a similar complaint. And yet, it may well happen, that owing to pathological idiosyncracies, what is health and life to us may be death to him.

It would be temerarious indeed, to break a lance for Autocracy, at a time when half the world is Republic struck. Men's eyes are so dazzled by the glamor of "Universal Suffrage," the "sovereignty of the people," and various other political mirages and catchwords, that it is almost an impertinence to ask them to examine

if the new system be not the old one in a new dress? and the new methods the old ones with more euphonious names?

Whenever the new system is proclaimed in any part of the world by a handful of soldiers, or would-be politicians, are not the old methods of repression and "stamping out," so bitterly reproached to autocratic rulers, immediately resorted to by these apostles of freedom and Republican forms against all who dare to advocate the old system, or offer any opposition to the new government?

The infallibility, *de facto*, this inalienable *ex hypothesi*, without which no form of government can exist, is loudly proclaimed by the new rulers, and in spite of their much vaunted "majesty," the "sovereign people" are not long in discovering that the rule of King Majority, and sometimes of King Minority too, is quite as absolute as that of any of those old time despots, who swore by the "divine right of Kings."

Ardent free Tradists, citizens are condemned in the name of Liberty to live and die Protectionists. Prohibitionists, by earnest conviction, they must endure to the end the hateful eye sore of liquor saloons on every street corner. Nay, they must submit to the added grievance of liquor franchises, and to the vexations of a McKinley Bill, and a tariff that protects everything but the homespun product of the brain; even manufactures that do not exist, that of albumenized paper for instance, and tin plate.

The relations between the governed and the governing being, therefore, much the same in substance,

under all circumstances, the substitution of one form of government for another is not necessarily an indication of progress.

When justice and uprightness reign the nation is free, be the government what it may. But when self-seeking and corruption lurk in high places, the nation is in bondage, be the suffrage never so universal.

During the thirteen years of his reign which have elapsed since 1881, Alexander the Third, whom even Mr. George Kennan admits to be "a well meaning man,"* has been unremitting in his vigilance, and in his efforts to reform the bureaucracy and eliminate Teutonic formalism and red tapeism, which rendered the administration of justice in particular so complicated and protracted.

The cumulation of offices, another fruitful source of evils, has also been abolished, and reforms in the department of education, have removed one of the principal causes of the Revolutionary movement by opening to Russian youth careers which had seemed hitherto to be the monopoly of privileged foreigners, German Jews in particular. It was the lack of expansion for their intellectual energies that often led young people of the rapidly increasing educated proletariat to engage in political conspiracies by way of expending the mental activity, for which they found so little scope.

Alexander the Third is a Slav and a Slavophil, *par excellence*; he believes that Russia has in her own tra-

*This admission was made before Mr. Kennan discovered "that the rulers of Russia to-day are oppressors, whose chief aim seems to be the destruction of all the liberal institutions that their predecessors founded." July, 1893, *Century*,

ditions and institutions all the elements needed for her consolidation and edification, and that to herself, only, must she look for her own salvation. With unerring logic, too, has he pursued two fundamental policies—the Russianizing or homogenizing of Russia, and the extirpation from her midst of all parasite growths.

The position of Finland and some of the Baltic Provinces, had been, hitherto, somewhat that of a “nation within a nation,” as the inhabitants of these provinces spoke their respective languages, and were governed by local laws and customs. Not long since when some well intentioned German-American priests tried to have the mother tongue exclusively used in churches and parochial schools, frequented by German immigrants, a cry of “Cahenlyism” was raised, and the movement was soon crushed out, as being un-American and unconstitutional. Yet, when Alexander the Third resolved to Russianize his outlying provinces, and decreed that none but the Russian language should, henceforth, be used in public schools, and that these provinces should be governed by the same laws as the rest of the Empire, a wail of vituperation went up from the English speaking Press on either side of the Atlantic. A truly enlightened policy was denounced as mediæval persecution, and anathemas were hurled at the perpetrator of retrograde barbarisms.

An “Ostee Junker,” Samson Himmelstierna by name, has recently written a voluminous work on Russia from the exclusive point of view of an “Ostee Junker,” that is, a Roman Catholic member of the Ger-

man nobility of the Ostee or Baltic provinces, whose reign of tyranny and oppression over the peasantry of these countries has ceased since their annexation with Russia, during the last century. The Macmillans have published a mutilated translation, by J. Morrison, of this work, with a long introduction and copious notes by Volkhovsky, an adept of the school of "Stepniak." Neither the translator nor the editor seems to have much respect for, nor sympathy with the author, beyond that inspired by the bond of a common enmity against Russia; and the title, "Russia under Alexander III" is a misnomer, for the book deals chiefly with what can be alleged against Russia prior to 1881, year of the present Czar's accession to the throne.

For Mr. Samson, "the whole Russian people are nothing else than a horde of barbarians," whose "historic mission has been to crush out all Western culture." *Fas est ab hoste doceri*—and a few passages gleaned from so unimpeachable a document as the work of this Russophobist, will throw some light on the condition of Finland, in the past, and since her annexation with Russia, (1808) and also, by analogy, on that of the Baltic Provinces, if we, substitute the words "Swedish nobility"—for "Ostee Junkers." For, in Esthuania, Livonia, and Courland, as in Finland and Poland, the welfare and interests of the peasant masses had been, for centuries, sacrificed to those of the aristocracy.

During the reign of Charles IX of Sweden, who had captured Moscow and Novgorod, chiefly with the aid of his Finnish troops (1617) we read: "that it was only "then, that the real period of suffering commenced for

"the not only neglected, but actually misused and "maltreated Step brother."

"On the abdication of Queen Christina, Finland was "a bundle of little principalities; two-thirds of the "country and one-third of the revenue had been given "away to noblemen living in Sweden, who were for "the most part foreigners. Finland became the plunder ground of the Swedish aristocracy, who were "granted oppressive privileges—Church patronage, "judicial and political powers &c." (Russia under Alexander III, p. 112.)

Later on, in 1658, we find: "That Finland was "again exploited by greedy and corruptible Swedish "judges and officials." (Ibid, p. 114.) Thirty years later, "a total suppression of the Finnish language was aimed at," while "the constant miseries of wars "were obviously intensified by the total neglect and "abandonment of Finland by Sweden." (P. 116.)

After the peace of Nystadt, 1721, "the exceedingly "ly thoughtless and wild rule of the nobility, disgraced by the constant party hatred of the Hats and "Caps," contributed towards estranging "the hearts "of the Finns." (P. 118.) And subsequently to the treaty of Abo, between Russia and Sweden, 1742, "instead of allaying the increased discontent in Finland, by refraining from acts of injustice, the Swedish nobility preferred to introduce a regular reign "of terror, by making use of a severe press gang system, and keeping a strict watch over all malcontents, who were speedily brought to trial and "executed."

Such was the hapless condition of Finland under

Swedish rule, if we may rely on statements made in "Russia, under Alexander III."

Regarding the condition of Finland since her annexation with Russia, we read in the same work, p. 296, that "whereas, during a long period of the Swedish rule, trade and industry had been artificially kept down, in Finland, in 1851 it possessed 148 manufactures, with a produce of about five million Finnish marks, and in 1876, this figure reached the figure of 60 millions. In 1825, Finland possessed 250 ships, trading with foreign parts; in 1882, the mercantile navy comprised 1980 vessels, among them 152 steamers."

"In 1810, the State revenue amounted to 6,700,000 marks; in 1882, it reached the impressive total of 36,320,714."

In view of these facts and figures, let us judge for ourselves, if these Provinces (for as I remarked *ex uno omnes*,) have advanced or retrograded since their annexation with Russia, and whether the further Russianizing of these countries should be deprecated as a calamity, and branded as barbaric persecution, "nothing but the fanatical degradation of culture to the lowest depth of barbarism," (p. 131,) unless some unforeseen calamity overtake their giant oppressor, "for his body is corrupt and covered with sores." Sic Samson Himmelstierna, p. 132, Ibid.

The remarkable progress made by these Provinces since their annexation with Russia, finds its counterpart in the annals of Poland, since her final dismemberment, and particularly during the last decade. In proof of what I allege, I transcribe a passage from the

work of Robert Mackenzie, who can hardly be accused of Russophil tendencies. "By three gigantic acts of spoliation, the guilt and the gains of which were shared with Austria and Prussia, Poland was effaced from the map of Europe. Russia has justly been blamed for the severities which she inflicted on Poland. In judging of the relations of the two countries, it should, however, be remembered, first that for six centuries there had been continual war between Poland and Russia; that Poland was habitually the aggressor; that, being the stronger, she inflicted terrible evils upon Russia, and sought by diplomacy, as well as by war, to strangle the national life of her rival. When Russia, now grown strong, shared in the final assault upon Poland, she was not attacking a harmless neighbor, she was avenging centuries of cruel wrong. Second, at the time of the dismemberment, the Poles were 'in the lowest state of degradation—ignorant, indolent, poor, drunken, improvident.' The recent reports of the English consuls, represent the condition of Poland as most satisfactory. There 'is a very remarkable progress in commerce, agriculture and manufacture.' 'The country is becoming rich and prosperous beyond all expectation.' (See the "Nineteenth Century," by Robert Mackenzie, page 379.)

I do not ignore the fact that when these countries, Finland in particular, were annexed, certain concessions were made to the inhabitants regarding the preservation of their local usages and customs. But may it not happen in the course of a hundred years, that a government finds it advisable, nay, imperative, to

change its policy regarding the administration of annexed provinces?

Does England govern India to-day as she did in 1793? Would there, indeed, be a British Indian Empire, if she had not repeatedly "foreclosed the mortgage," to use Mr. Trevelyan's expression in describing the process of annexing native principalities, whose relative or absolute independence had been guaranteed at the outset.

Majestically unmindful of the howls of ignorance and malevolence, Alexander the Third pursued the even tenor of his way, though the vociferations of his slanderers became louder, when, in conjunction with the policy of homogenizing, the policy of extirpation only a correlative was carried out by the revival of many of the anti-Semitic laws, framed by Ignatieff in 1881, but which had practically remained in abeyance.

It must be borne in mind that the Russian Jew, unlike his congeners in other parts of the world, is pre-eminently subversive and refractory to all national amalgamation. It is among them that the bacillus of nihilism was fostered, and their unrestricted admission to seats of learning and rural districts, was invariably followed by a crop of discontent and rebellion. Scattered among a rural population, they remain essentially non-productive. When they do happen to own land they almost invariably sell it, or rent it to Christian farmers. Like the miseltoe and other parasites, they have no roots in the soil, but they draw their sustenance from the poor delvers of the earth, who themselves extract but a scant subsistence therefrom. As

publicans and usurers, they prey upon the populations of rural districts. At their low taverns and saloons the poor peasants are often enticed into drinking away the last grain of their hardly raised crop, even before it is harvested. And when the crop is pledged in advance, gaunt famine soon stares them in the face. Bread must he had, and the Jew is at hand to lend money at most extortionate rates, on the stock and land, which soon pass out of the hands of the peasants, who become the hapless wage workers of the Hebrew. The latter even holds a mortgage on the very sinews and time of his victims, who are thus reduced to a kind of serfdom far more appalling than that from which they were emancipated.

As a striking commentary on what I have just advanced, I transcribe the following passages that were not written for pot-boiling or party interests, but are spontaneous observations made by distinguished travelers at different extremities of the globe—in California and in Russia, in 1877 and in 1892.

The first of these passages is from R. J. Stoddard's "Across Russia," page 236, Scribner.

"If those philanthropists, who in America and England know little or nothing of the ways and habits of Jews in such countries as Russia and Poland, could spend a few days among them, and see how they live, and what sort of people they are, their views regarding them might be changed. * * *

"As a people, they are always shrewd, money getting, lying and unclean, and hostile to the moral and physical welfare of the places where they dwell. A peculiar people, never assimilating with other nations,

“ though dwelling among them, they drain, by individual extortion and cheating, the resources of those among whom they dwell, contribute little to the general wealth, and nothing to the public happiness. They evade the laws which are designed to hinder their evil practices, and make themselves so odious to the communities which they invade that their toleration is only a question of time.”

The second of these two passages is from Robert Louis Stevenson's "Silverado Squatters," p. 78, Roberts Brothers.

The Jew store-keepers "in California, profiting at once, by the needs and habits of the people, have made themselves, in too many cases, the tyrants of the rural population. Credit is offered, is pressed on the new comer, and when, once, he is beyond his depth, the tune changes, and he is, from henceforth, a white slave. I believe, even from the little I saw, that Kelmar, if he wished to put on the screw, could send half the farmers packing within a radius of seven or eight miles round Calistoga. These are continually paying him, but are never allowed to get out of debt. He palms dull goods upon them, for they dare not refuse to buy, etc."

It is an unfortunate fact that the only thing that prevents people of small means from borrowing is the want of security. Now the farmer always has something to pledge, his land, or at any rate, his stock and implements; and, as long as any of these are still in his possession, the usurer dogs his footsteps, as the leech and the horsefly pursue their victims. When we add to this fact a little knowledge of the character of

the Russian peasant, who is the most reckless and improvident of borrowers, can we wonder any longer, that the Czar, whom every moujik calls his "Little Father," should seek to protect these poor simple tillers of the soil from the harpies who prey upon the vitals of the country? I use the word vitals advisedly, for as I have said elsewhere, the heart of Russia throbs in every rural commune. There, are found the true arteries of the nation, its latent strength, and the pledge of its longevity and unlimited expansion. When Napoleon I, who called England a "nation of shop-keepers," sneeringly declared, "that Russia was nothing but a nation of peasants," he forgot that no people can be permanently great and powerful without a strong rural population. Carthage, Phœnicia and Genoa were commercial queens in their day, but they lacked this element of stability, and their reign was but short-lived. So, among all nations, the decadence of agricultural pursuits and national decadence are found to be synchronous.

In interdicting white men from settling on the Indian Réservations, the Government of the United States was evidently actuated by a laudable desire to protect these wards of the nation from being imposed upon and over-reached by sharpers of every description. And, no one ever thought of stigmatizing this policy as tyrannical; not even when troops were under orders from Washington to eject, by force, an enterprising railroad man of the name of Ross, who insisted on carrying his works through one of these reservations. (New York Herald, April, 1893.) Why then should the policy of Alexander the Third, in exclud-

ing the Jews from rural districts raise such a hue and cry ?

The Press has plied us with the verbiage of horrent large type and italicised exclamations on the subject, till we have been almost led to believe that the Jews were compressed into a space, about as limited, as the "Black Hole," of Calcutta ; and, that in consequence of this privation of light and oxygen, they were dying off like sheep in a murrain.

Now the true facts of the case are, that the Jews compose about one sixteenth of the Russian population, say about six millions :—the "Jewish Pale," or that portion of the Empire in which they may legally dwell, is on the south-west of Russia, the side by which they first entered, and it comprises the provinces of Poland, Bessarabia, Vilna, Nirebsk, Volhynia, Grodno, Ekaterinoslaf, Taurica, Kershow, Tchernigof, Kowno, etc. Now, surely six or seven million Hebrews can find breathing space and elbow room, in a territory of over 400,000 square miles ? Their not being allowed to live outside towns and townlets, at the present moment, should scarcely be considered a great hardship, seeing that they have no use for the soil, and eschew all manner of agricultural pursuits.

The following statistics should tend to allay all fears as to the Jews being literally exterminated in Russia :—

	JEW.	ALL OTHERS.
1867-71.....	61,420.....	2,132,000
1872-76.....	71,720.....	3,207,000
1877-81.....	76,180.....	3,200,200
1882-86.....	90,040.....	3,815,800

At this ratio the Jews could double their number in thirty years, whereas it would take the Russians ninety years to double theirs. Surely, a condition of things as alarming as that which suggested to the Pharoahs the expediency of suppressing every male child of the Hebrews. If Russian Jews would lay aside their clannishness, and adopt the Russian language and customs as they do those of the Americans in the United States; if they would do a little less smuggling and a little more farming, they would be treated on the same footing as other Russian subjects who are of different race and creed from the Slavs, but have no reason to complain of their treatment. Nor would Russian Jews need to come all the way to New Jersey to have farms allotted them by the Hirsch fund, for the Russian Government would be only too happy to found agricultural colonies for them in that vast empire, where there is land enough and to spare. Moreover, it is noteworthy that Hebrews who are law abiding, and exercising some legitimate business, are, as a rule, unmolested in Russia, even in cities where they have not legally the right to dwell. In St. Petersburg, strange to say, many of the lawyers and most of the merchants are Jews, and they have recently erected in the heart of the metropolis a magnificent synagogue of Moorish architecture, which is a standing protest against the outcry of religious persecution.

In the abstract, it does seem strange that subjects of a certain class should not have the right to dwell in any part of the empire, they may choose; but circumstances alter cases, and the question must be examined

in the concrete, and not in the abstract only. Jews have never been really incorporated with the Russian nation. In the days of serfdom they did not fall under the law of Boris Godonof, which applied to Slavs only, and they are always free to emigrate to any country and become naturalized citizens thereof, whereas the Russian Slav is always a Russian subject. The position of the Jews in Russia though more advantageous in many respects, is, in fact, not unlike that of the Chinese in the United States, though I never heard of a Chinaman being admitted to the bar in America. Nor have the Jews ever been ejected by law, and *en masse*, from the land of their adoption; they have simply been subjected, as semi aliens, to certain restrictions, to which poor John Chinaman would, gratefully and cheerfully have subscribed, if any choice had been left him.

It will not be inapposite to transcribe here the following passage from the New York Herald, regarding Russian persecution of the Jews, into which Congress had requested the Secretary of State to inquire:

RUSSIA AND THE JEWS.

THE HEBREWS THEMSELVES DENY THE STORIES OF
PERSECUTION.

(*New York Herald.*)

WASHINGTON, Oct. 16, 1890.—Secretary Blaine has been informed by the Minister of the United States at St. Petersburg, in regard to the various reports of the alleged persecution by the Russian government of the Hebrews living in that country; that upon a thorough investigation, it is a source of special gratification to be able to present not only

the denial of the Russian government, but of the Hebrews themselves, and confirmatory testimony that these injurious allegations are baseless.

He goes on to say, that it appears that a statement recently appeared in the London Times, stating that, despite the disavowal of the Russian government, some five or six hundred Hebrew families residing at Odessa had been summarily notified that they must immediately abandon their homes, and, in fact, had already been expelled. Soon after this publication appeared, the British Embassy at St. Petersburg called upon the British Consul at Odessa to make a full investigation of the same. The Consul reports that the same is not only denied by the Government, but by the Hebrews themselves, even more emphatically by the latter. No such order was issued, and no movement of the kind attempted.

The report evidently originated from the fact that some Hebrew families had voluntarily, on their own part, emigrated, or were preparing to do so. The Rabbis and highest authorities explained this emigration as due to the fact that in the Hebrew families there were many youths, and as the number admitted to the universities was limited, they removed to other countries to secure the opportunity of higher education, and that there was no ground for the charges against the Government.

(New York Herald, 1893.)

A dispatch from St. Petersburg, May 8, 1893, announces that the Russian government proposes to convene a commission of Rabbis next September, to take the whole Hebrew question into consideration, and assist in bringing it to a settlement.

It must be admitted that Alexander the Third is a genuine *mujik* in his personal antipathy for the Jewish race. But Russia is certainly not the only country where Jews are regarded with misgiving and aversion.

The anti-Semite party is strong in France, and still more so in Germany. In the latter country it is alleged that the Reuter Telegram Company and the Wolff News Bureau are combined to promote the control of the world by the Jews. Money and the press are trumps to-day, and it cannot be gainsaid that both these cards are in their hands all over the world. In the New York World, September 26th, 1893, we read that in Berlin the Anti-Semite party "have formulated a parliamentary programme, that proposes to forbid Hebrew immigration, to prohibit Hebrews from owning land or taking mortgages on it, to export all Hebrews not natives, and to shut Hebrews out of the learned and military professions."

This is not the programme of an autocratic government, but of liberal members of the German Reichstag.

In free England the Test and Corporation Act, which in 1828, restored the rights of citizenship to all dissenters from the Anglican Church, imposed new disabilities on the Jews. "By it," says Sir Erskine May, "a Jew could not hold any office, civil, military or corporate. He could not follow the law as a barrister, or attorney's clerk; he could not be a schoolmaster or an usher of a school. He could not sit as a member of either House of Parliament, nor even exercise the elector's franchise if called upon to take the elector's oath."

In 1852, Mr. Solomons, more pugnacious than Baron Lionel Rothschild, insisted on taking his seat in Parliament when he was elected for Greenwich. He was ousted by the sergeant-at-arms, and furnished a test

case to the Court of Exchequer, that decided against the Jew candidate.

It was not till 1858, after much bickering and compromising, that the Jews were finally made eligible to all public offices without being required to subscribe to the obnoxious shiboleth, "on the true faith of a Christian,"

The maintenance of religious unity may also be considered a correlative of the policy of homogenizing, and has given rise to many accusations of persecution against Alexander the Third.

We have already seen that, historically and politically, Russia has developed in conditions that were in nowise analogous to those of other European nations. In 870 the Greek Emperors and the clergy of Constantinople alike appealed to and recognized the authority of the Pontiff of Rome, when Pope Nicholas and the Eighth General Council deposed Photius, who had usurped the place of the venerable patriarch Ignatius. But eight years later the ambitious Photius, abetted by a new Emperor, again assumed the patriarchal dignity, shook off his allegiance to Rome, and added heresy to schism by leaving out a word from the Credo. Instead of "*qui ex Patre Filioque procedit*," the Greek Church henceforth read, "*Qui ex Patre procedit*." The rupture with Rome was not, however, consummated till 1053 by the Patriarch Michel Cerularius, who was himself deposed and exiled by the Emperor Isaac Commène.

It was in these unfortunate circumstances, that Russia's rulers received the Christian religion from Constantinople. Had she been christianized a few

years sooner, her history would probably have been quite different, and more like that of the rest of Europe. Henceforth, and more especially after her subjugation by the Tartars, Russia became an exile—a pariah, in fact, politically, socially and religiously speaking, to the rest of Europe. No Peter the Hermit arose to preach a Crusade on her behalf, no Cœur de Lion, no Godfrey de Bouillon crossed himself to deliver her from the infidel Turk. No Bernard of Clairvaux, no Thomas Aquinas, no Pic de la Mirandole, no Albertus Magnus, lent lustre to her annals in these Dark Ages. While the Realists and Nominalists of the Germanic Universities were waging hot warfare over split hairs, and consigning each other to unpleasant nether regions, because they could not agree, as to whether ivory from the elephant's tusk was real ivory, or only nominal ivory. Russia was eking out a hard and precarious existence from day to day, while each to-morrow threatened to be the last of her national existence.

There was none, in their hour of abasement, and isolation, to whom the people of Russia could look, but to their clergy. For their Princes had fallen into moral as well as political servitude to their conquerors. It was the Greek clergy, who kept alive the flickering spark of patriotism in Prince and people, and fanned the dying embers of national self-respect—who used their influence, alike, with Tartar dominator and vassal prince, to render the condition of the people more endurable. It was the clergy who roused the slumbering energies of Prince and people, to avail themselves of a favorable moment, and shake off the Tartar yoke.

No wonder, then, as I remarked elsewhere, that indissoluble bonds of union were established between the nation and the National Church—that “Orthodoxy” is, for every Russian, another name for Hearth and Fatherland.

For some unknown reason, the words Greek and Orthodox are always used to designate the National Church in Russia, though it is neither Greek nor Orthodox.

The period of Tartar domination was the Golden Age of this Church. Her clergy, then, were by no means inferior, as the times went.

When the Grand Dukes of Moscow assumed control of the whole country, the State absorbed the Church, as well as the independent Republics and the minor principalities. The union and identity of Church and State thus became so close, that it was difficult, henceforth, to separate them. A renegade from the National Church was regarded as a traitor to his flag and his country, and treated as such.

I do not wish to dilate on the evil consequences which the Schism of Photius entailed on Russia, and on the Eastern Church in general. I only note the fact of the peculiar identity that exists, in Russia, between Church and State. In England, the conditions were never the same after Henry VIII shook off the supremacy of the Pope, and assumed the title of Supreme Head of the Anglican Church.

Though much has been written about religious intolerance in Russia, it is a curious fact, that Religious Tests, which were not finally abolished in Britain till 1858, have never been known in Russia. A man's

religious opinions are no bar sinister to his holding office in State and Army. The highest military and civil positions have been, and are still, held by Lutherans, Anglicans, Roman Catholics, Mahomedans. Loris Melikoff, Count Nesselrode, Alikhanoff, are a few instances of this religious toleration. The present Prefect of St. Petersburg, is a Lutheran, and I could cite many other examples.

The only person in the Empire who is subjected to a Religious Test on entering into office, is the Czar of all the Russias. The most important part of the ceremony of Coronation, is the Public Profession of Faith that the Czar makes before he is anointed.

It is as binding on the Russian Sovereign to maintain the integrity of the Greek Orthodox Church, as it is on other rulers, to safeguard the Constitutions of their respective countries—as it is on the Popes to maintain their right to the temporal estates bestowed on them by Charlemagne.

Independently of these considerations, there are others that make the repression of the religious sects that swarm in Russia just now, a matter of grave import for the national welfare. To explain what I wish to convey, I quote the following passage from “E. B. Lanin,” a prejudiced writer, but one who is certainly well informed on Russian subjects. (Contemporary Review, Jan. 7, 1893.)

“Every Russian may be said to bear within him,
“the leaven of religious mania. Hundreds of Christs
“and Virgins are being continually born in Russia,
“and find thousands of worshippers and disciples.
“Mystic sects are continually being formed and dis-

“solved like cloud pictures, throughout the length and breadth of the land, and no more striking instance can be given of the power and extent of that mystic element over the Russian mind, than the recent remarkable transformation of the most rationalistic of Russian Sects, (Stundism,) which has rapidly drifted from cold rationalism into the vortex of ecstasy, exaltation and madness, which distinguish the Dancers of Toranto.” What E. B. Lanin says of Stundists, is equally true of Rasconliks. Is it not, indeed, the common fate of religious sects, all over the world, to drift away completely from the lines on which they were originally formed?

Until the seventeenth century, religious sects were unknown in Russia. The political and civil conditions were such, that the “leaven of religious mania,” to which E. B. Lanin refers, did not get a chance to ferment.

The insignificant liturgical reforms instituted by Nikon, the Metropolitan of Moscow, during the reign of Peter the Great, were the signal for the protestations of the Rascols, or the old believers, who regarded, as blasphemous, any change made in the ancient customs by priest or Cæsar.

The Rascols were the Non-Conformists and Puritans of Russia. Not only did they split up into a multitude of sects, like the latter in England, but the spirit of mysticism and dissent, so long latent, became rampant. To-day, it is computed, that there are about thirteen million sectarians in Russia, who have revived the teachings of many of the heresies of the Middle Ages, particularly the communistic theories. Circon-

cillians, Albigenes, Vandois, Flagellants, etc., etc., all find imitators and caricaturists among the mujiks.

The latter are so possessed with Henry George's theory concerning land, that any one who preaches this to them as the fundamental article of religious creed, can graft thereon, all kinds of extravagances and recruit followers.

There are, no doubt, honest, earnest men like Tolstoi, to be found among dissenters from the National Church. But many of these sects, unfortunately, are addicted to obscene and cruel rites, common to fanatics in all ages and climes. They are given to the coarsest superstitions, worship the devil, denounce all authority, spiritual or temporal, and often mutilate and kill themselves and others, in the insanity of religious exaltation. When such as these are punished, a hue and cry of religious persecution is raised all over the world. Because these fanatics justify their immoral and cruel practices by the Bible, which they read assiduously, evangelical, and Bible Society Christians denounce Alexander the Third as Antichrist and the Arch Persecutor of "those who search the Scriptures." This is absolutely false. Neither Leo Tolstoi, nor any man in Russia who is capable of forming religious theories, no matter how extravagant, is molested, so long as he is moral, and law-abiding, and does not seek to propagate practices contrary to public order.

When a man, for instance, feels persuaded that war is unlawful, and that no one should be a soldier, we say that he has a perfect right to his opinion, which is probably not unfounded. But when he seeks to propa-

gate his opinions, and rouses his fellow-citizens to reduce them to practice in a country that is compelled to maintain large standing armies, and has a severe system of military conscription, the case is altered. He becomes a teacher and abettor of sedition and revolt, amenable to the laws of the State, that would not have interfered with his freedom of conscience, but does, most emphatically, coerce his freedom of action when it is subversive of public order.

Independently of the streak of religious mania and anarchy which are innate in the Slavs, human nature, in general, is always apt to seek escape from material evils by oblivion, the Lethe of the ancients. The moujik drowns the horrors of a Russian winter in vodka and seeks surcease from the dreary monotony of his hard life, in visions, ecstasy and religious excesses. So long as these pastimes are indulged in, in private, there is no danger to the community. But we all know that in every agglomeration of individuals a magnetic current is generated, powerful for good or evil; and the Russian government would be wanting indeed, if it did not do its utmost to suppress the meetings of these wild visionaries, whose religious saturnalia would not be tolerated for a moment by Mr. Comstock, however protected they might be, in theory, by the Constitution of the United States. "Angel Dancers" in New Jersey did not escape police coercion and incarceration, recently.

That religious thought will and must work out various channels for itself in Russia, as everywhere else, is as certain as that mountain streams will overleap their banks, and find new beds, as they hasten

oceanwards. But it is clearly the duty of the government of a nation of grown up children to guide and restrain them from pernicious excesses. At least, until they have reached an age when they are capable of reason, discretion and moderation.

No man is allowed in any civilized country to doctor his fellow-men without a license. Why, then, should any uneducated, cranky peasant, endowed with a mesmeric faculty, be allowed to set up as a teacher and prophet of his equally ignorant brethren?

That the Greek clergy has, since two centuries, somewhat failed in its mission, and retrograded, is an unfortunate fact, though not without ample palliation. Alexander the Third, keenly alive to all that concerns his peasant subjects, has been strenuous in his endeavors to educate and elevate the Orthodox clergy, so that they may become better fitted to be the educators of the people. Melchior de Vogué affirms, from personal observation, that in many parishes of the Empire a marked improvement is noticeable.

If it were given to Leo the Thirteenth and Alexander the Third to accomplish the important work of reuniting the Greek and Latin Churches, we should, ere many years, see a great empire, or rather a Grand Confederation, which would be without a parallel in the world's history, and would prove a precious rampart on the east of Europe, should this continent be again menaced by Mongolian hordes, as in the days of Gengis Kahn and Tamerlane.

"It was neither the French nor the English who defeated us in the Crimean War," said a Russian officer, "it was our own administration;" and this was equally

true of the reverses which the Russians sustained at Plewna.

The rapacity and venality of State officials has always been a subject of anxious preoccupation for the Czars, but the evil is so inveterate that it can only be extirpated by radical measures, which would be premature at the present hour. This plague spot was imported from the East, and borrowed from Constantinople. Among Orientals, bribery is a very venial offence, if an offence at all. Even among the Romans, and under the Feudal System, those who held influential positions in the Senate, or at Court, received money, or were paid in specie by their inferiors, to whom they extended protection, or patronage. But such practices can no longer be tolerated by the refined conscience of modern civilization. If they do exist, it is in an inverse sense generally. It is the "Sovereign people," who are now bribed by those who need their suffrages, in order to become their rulers.

Venality among public officials was so flagrant in the time of Peter the Great, that the irate Czar once swore that "he would hang every officer, who stole so much as a rope."—"Then you will have to hang us all, said his confidential minister, for we all steal, "the only difference lies in the quantity stolen, and in "the manner of stealing."

Neither Peter, nor his successors seem to have succeeded in extirpating the evil; for, the Czar Nicholas declared, with too much truth, unfortunately, that "he was the only honest official in the empire."

In 1880-1881, under the administration of Loris Melikoff, four Senators, whose probity was unimpeachable, were commissioned to investigate and report.

Most unusual publicity was given to the result of these investigations, and for weeks, the press and the public indulged in unlimited vituperation of the misdemeanors and peculations of officials of all ranks. From the Grand Duke at the head of the naval department, to the subaltern of the Commissariat, and the hostler who deprived the horses of their quantum of fodder, they all diverted the public money into their own pockets. The following year the Czar Alexander II was assassinated, and since then, no publicity has been given to similar investigations. It was hardly to be expected.

Though bribery and corruption are by no means confined to Russia, as we all know full well, yet it is easy to understand, that in a country, where public opinion and an unmerciful Press are not constantly unearthing offenders and denouncing them to Justice, these evils may acquire dangerous proportions, and become a serious danger to the State.

One of Bismarck's favorite maxims was that "in the profession of politics there was no honest man;" and while he was in power, he, unhesitatingly, utilized every available talent, even if it were picked up in the slums. Whereas Alexander the Third, who is the quintessence of honor and uprightness, has so great a horror of all dishonesty, that he will not tolerate anyone around him, whom he even suspects of being lacking in this respect. In consequence of his profound antipathy for all kinds of dishonesty, he often deprives himself of the assistance of men, who happen to have more brain than conscience; and maintains in power many whose chief recommendation is an answering probity and singleness of purpose.

The Czar is himself scrupulously conscientious, and husbands the resources of the State as though he were only a Steward, liable to be called to account at any moment. Like Nicholas, he is an indefatigable worker, and tries to go into the details of every subject with a zeal that is apt to be detrimental to the general good. Alexander the Third has a private letter box and flatters himself that any and all communications reach him: but it is greatly to be feared, that his imperial majesty's correspondence is more tampered with than that of any of his subjects.

No breath of scandal has ever tarnished his fair fame, (the barefaced lies of nihilists do not count) and he shares with the late Count de Chambord (Henri V.) the rare distinction of being a perfect royal gentleman. Simple in his tastes, frugal in his habits, wholly impervious to feminine wiles, devoted to his task, firm and sagacious, it is hard to understand how this monster of official corruption continues to flourish in the light of a throne, resplendent with so many virtues.

Alexander the Third began his reign with the firm intention of stamping out this inveterate evil, by every means compatible with autocracy. If he does not use means available under advanced Republican governments—it is not as Mr. Volkhovsky alleges, because of his anxiety “to transmit undiminished to his children and grandchildren this power”—which to himself is such an undesirable burden—but because he sees, with every impartial and disinterested observer, that in the actual status of the country, only a strong autocratic hand, at the helm, can keep the evil of official venality and pilfering in check, and prevent its acquiring the proportions it would rapidly reach, if the country were

now given over to constitutional, or parliamentary anarchy.

The Czar has made many examples among dishonest officials of high rank, and even in his own household. But he has been so unfortunate as to incur the reprobation of Mr. Felix Volkhovsky in that he did not administer condign punishment to Count Lieven, Minister of State Domains, and other stealers of "Virgin oak forests"—1,358,148 acres it is alleged. Indeed, the Czar is even accused of compounding with felony, in that he restored some of the offenders to office, in view, it is said, of covering his own stealing of a slice of the oasis of Merv. (Introduction to Alexander III by Himmelstierna.)

I do not pretend to controvert the fact of the forest stealing, nor do I question the exact number of the acres stolen. I would venture, only, to remark that it is the prerogative of all rulers, even of provincial governors, and governors in Republican States to relieve certain criminals and give them a chance of retrieving their ill doings. Moreover, I should like to inquire if Mr. Volkhovsky's knowledge of the statistics of bribery and corruption in other countries has led him to believe that parliamentary and republican institutions are so infallible a panacea against these evils, that Alexander the Third ought, at his suggestion, to give them a trial immediately, and at all hazards?*

*MINNESOTA. ROBBED OF MILLIONS.

STARTLING DISCOVERIES MADE BY THE PINE LAND INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE.

[*By* Telegraph to *The Herald*.]

ST PAUL, Nov. 2, 1893. —The Minnesota Executive Pine Land Investigating Committee made some startling discoveries during its session

It is true that one will, however resolute and powerful cannot accomplish everything in a limited span of years, in a country whose area is greater than that of the full moon, according to Humboldt.

Russia, as I have already remarked, is in a transition state since fifty years. "She has left one bank and has not yet reached the other." The emancipation of a handful of negroes in the United States has created problems of grave menace to the future of the Republic. How much greater must be the complications of a government that has, so recently, conferred the rights of citizenship on about forty millions of its subjects, hitherto debarred therefrom?

In the lives of nations a thousand years are but as one day in the life of the individual. Generations of men pass, and are buried away, ingloriously, in the building up of a national structure, like the myriads of little carcasses whose dust serves to build up the Coral Islands of the Pacific Ocean.

The true test of the progress of a nation is not found by applying a microscope to its actual shortcomings and deficiencies, but by comparing it with itself in the present and in the past. Judged by this test, Russia can certainly challenge the criticism of the most unprepossessed observer. The enthusiastic

yesterday. The session was an executive one, but Chairman Ignatius Donnelly made public some of the findings last evening. He said:—

"The State has been robbed of millions of dollars by some of its most prominent citizens. Some of the robberies are of the most surprising character. Logs have been stolen by wholesale without pretext of title to ownership. We have found one case where the State of Minnesota was paid for 600,000 feet of lumber, and the quantity of lumber actually taken from the tract measured more than six million feet."

reception given, recently, to the Russian fleet by the French is an interesting sign of the times, and a proof of the remarkable strides made by Russia since a hundred years. In the eighteenth century St. Petersburg was a boggy marsh inhabited chiefly by bears and wolves, and the Muscovites were no more considered in Europe than are the Siamese or Persians, at the present time.—To-day, France, so long the leader and the dominator of Europe, feels flattered and reassured by the friendship and alliance of the contemned Muscovites.

We are impatient because we are mortal. Because the evils, that are the accumulated legacy of many untoward generations, are not all cured in a decade or two, some Russian patriots, as well as foreigners, are unsparing in their denunciations of a Ruler, whose every thought is devoted to the welfare of his country, and whose life is one continuous act of self-abnegation. For to Alexander the Third the burden of royalty is almost intolerable. "It is very hard lines, indeed, that I, of all others, should have to become Emperor of Russia," he is said to have exclaimed, when he was unexpectedly called to the throne, by the untimely death of his elder brother. The only happy hours of his life are when, on his free evenings, he shakes off the gilded trappings of State, dons a peasant's blouse with leather belt, and enjoys the society of his wife and children. By choice he would infinitely rather spend his life in physical and manual labor, of which he is as great an advocate as Leo Tolstoi. But hewing trees and planing lumber are pastimes in which the Czar of all the Russias may only indulge at his hours of recreation.

The argument against the Czar's government that George Kennan, *à l'instar* of "Stepniak," draws from the condition of these ci-devant serfs is unfair in the extreme. Is Russia, the only country in the world "where, as Mr. Kennan alleges "millions are engaged "in a desperate and almost hopeless struggle for a "bare subsistence?" Has Mr. Kennan never read about the Irish Peasantry and their sufferings in time of famine? Of the crofters on the bleak and barren uplands of Scotland? Of the starving multitudes who live "from hand to mouth" in London? Has no echo of the periodical famines that decimate millions of her majesty's subjects in India reached the pseudo champion of the alleged "people of Russia?"

Because these evils exist, does it follow that "The "Rulers of England" are oppressors, whose chief aim "seems to be the complete destruction of all the liberal institutions that their predecessors founded" or that her Britannic Majesty's Government should be made the target of every scribbling sensationalist?

Mr Samson Himmelstierna alleges against Alexander the Third that "he avoids the discussion of subjects with which he is not acquainted." (Russia under Alexander III p. 15.) This, I should say was that better part of valor, which many of the Czar's traducers would do well to imitate. Though he may, wisely, object to being taken out of his depths, Alexander III, in his unceasing efforts for the public weal, gives proof of the highest order of mind. Though he believes in exercising his royal prerogatives, he is never too wise to be taught, and earnestly seeks to enlighten his own judgment, by consulting with those who

are likely to be better informed. Like Peter the Great he sends Commissioners abroad to enquire into the most improved methods for conducting the different branches of industry and agriculture. Not long since, he sent a thousand years old Russia to the School of Young America to learn the best modes of cotton culture, of reclaiming lands by irrigation, and running railroads.

Still more recently Michael Kazarin, delegate of the Russian Minister of the Interior, and of the Russian Prison Administration, has been charged to inspect the Penitentiaries of the United States "to learn the exact methods of conducting American Prisons, in order that Russian Jails may be improved accordingly"—

"Prisons in Russia," said Mr. Kazarin, "have been greatly misrepresented by novelists and newspaper men who have travelled through our country. They obtained their information by interviewing prisoners and not by observation. It is not to be supposed that a man who is placed in prison likes it. He's not put there to like it or for his comfort. A prison is for punishment. Fifteen years ago Russian prisons were far behind those of other countries, but that cannot be said of them to-day. Millions of dollars have been expended in improving them during the last three years, and not a day passes that some change for the better does not take place.

"There is one thing connected with American prisons that would not be tolerated in Russia. It is the contract labor system. The sooner it is abolished the better it will be for the people in general. Men in

prisons in Russia do about the same class of work as prisoners in the United States. The articles manufactured by them are sold to retail dealers by the Government at the same price they would have to pay for them if they bought them of free producers. In America, producers cannot compete with contract labor and they suffer in consequence. I have talked with many high personal officials regarding the matter and they all unite in declaring the contract labor system a bad one.

“One thing is very noticeable about American prison rules, and that is the large number of visitors allowed to call upon the prisoners. In one penitentiary I visited, 10,000 visitors had been admitted during a year. In Russia, only relatives are allowed to see the prisoners, and then only on certain days. The rules regarding Siberian exiles are not half so strict as they used to be, and have been modified greatly recently. The majority of those sent to Siberia now are given tracts of land there, their families are allowed to accompany them and they are perfectly free, only they cannot leave the country.

“After being there some time, it is not difficult for them to receive pardons, if their conduct has been good. Many men sent to Siberia become quite wealthy and remain there for life, notwithstanding pardons. Of course, the worst classes of criminals sent there have to work in prisons so many years, and when they come out they are not allowed to leave the country. Many of these men are often given the privilege of returning to Russia.

“Altogether, I think American prisons the best in

the world, but Russia is rapidly making all the improvements you have. I think the new intermediate State reform prison, which is being built at Mansfield, Ohio, the most perfect prison, in every respect, I have seen in the United States.”—The Evening Telegram, New York, Sep. 9th, 1893.

This is “barbarous” Russia’s response and the only one she is likely to vouchsafe to the scathing criticisms of which she has been the object in the United States, among a certain class. It is in this magnanimous way that Alexander the Third responds to the abuse that has been heaped upon his government by a leading Magazine. I refer, in particular, to two virulent articles, by the Jew, Joseph Jacobs and George Kennan, that appeared in the July Century, 1893, at the very time when the officers of the Russian fleet sent here to do honor to the World’s Fair, were the guests of the City of New York.

Let us hope, *en passant*, that when Mr. M. Kazarin returns home, he will not go into the business of traducing this country to his compatriots, with a view to “making his everlasting fortune.”—Nothing would be easier for him, than to establish, by quotations from the daily Papers, that America was the chosen home of barbarism, oppression and crime.—He might refer sneeringly to the magnificent Penitentiary at Mansfield, Ohio, as one of our “Show Prisons,” and then drawing out a bundle of New York Worlds, regale his readers with the “horrors of the Elnira Prison”—or those described in this passage: “Cincinnati, July “14th, 1893. New York World. Thomas McKernan, a convict who had been shirking work, was sub-

“jected to horrible torture. . . . he was handcuffed
“and hanged by the wrists. . . . his ankles were
“weighted by a ball and chain,” etc., etc. He might
also moralize on the treatment meted out recently to
Emma Goldman, Zimmerman and other patriots, con-
victed and incarcerated in New York and New Jersey
—for no other crime than speaking out their minds
freely in public—and this in a country where free
speech and a free Press are the inalienable rights of
every citizen.

Nor could anyone say that his assertions were “un-
proved and unsupported” for he would be armed with
the New York Dailies and his Articles in the “North-
ern Messenger,” the “Messenger of Europe,” or the
“New Time” *Novoe Vremya*, etc., would be bristling
with quotations regarding *current* events, and not like
those of Mr. Kennan’s which refer chiefly to 1881-
1882-1885. In his Article (Century, July, 1893) Mr.
Kennan, unable to appreciate the tact and reticence
of Mr. Botkine in his “Voice for Russia”—Century,
Feb. 7, 1893) launches out on a very sea of interro-
gatory interjections, which he hurls one after the other
at the unarmed champion of a bad cause, minus
“proofs”—minus “extracts”—minus “selections”—
minus “statistics”—“minus all things”—Or nearly all
—The only prop of poor Mr. Botkine’s “unproved and
unsupported” assertions—is the Report of the Fourth
International Prison Congress. And this, the Goliath
of the alleged “people of Russia” proceeds to demol-
ish with logic so startling, that I cannot refrain from
a little digression. “They had neither experience
“nor knowledge to justify them in coming to any

“conclusion at all.”—Such is Mr. Kennan’s magisterial verdict. Primo, they were poaching on his preserves. Secundo, their assertions were “unproved and unsupported” by quotations from Mr. Kennan’s “Siberia and the Exile System” and from his “penologists of recognized reputation.”

We are further expected to believe, on the authority of the Times’ St. Petersburg Correspondent, and of Mr. Kennan’s correspondents, that “warned by the Chief of the Russian Prison Administration, that if they attempted to broach the “Siberian Scandals they would make a great mistake”—the Members of this Congress forthwith devoted themselves “to banquets, complimentary speeches, and “excursions”—this, too, at a time—says one of the “penologists of recognized reputation,” “when the “remarkable book of G. Kennan upon Siberia was “still fresh in the minds of many of its members.”—(p. 468, Century, July, ’93.)

In other words, the want of conformity in the judgment of these gentlemen with that of Mr. G. Kennan is to be attributed; firstly, to gross ignorance of the matter on hand: and, secondly, to eating and drinking too freely, instead of attending to the business that had taken them to Russia. They were even so perverse as not “to apply for information to Professor Sergeifski, Professor Foinitiski, Mr. Nitkin or “any Russian penologist of recognized reputation, “who would have furnished them with a translation “of two remarkable articles upon Russian Prison “methods written by a Russian expert, published in a “legal Journal of the highest character (?) and ex-

"pressly dedicated to the Members of the Fourth International Prison Congress." Finally, we may judge of the full depth of their perversity, when we are further informed that "the pictures of Russian Prison life presented by the author of these Articles are painted in colors as black as any that I (G. Kennan) have ever used and reproduced in an article entitled "The Truth about Russian Prisons," by E. B. Lanin in Fortnightly Review, July, 1890, "which inspired Swinburne's fiery poem in defense and justification of tyrannicide." Quite a pool among these gentlemen! G. Kennan, E. B. Lanin, Volkhovsky, and Dragomonof seem to have all things in common, and the way they quote from themselves, and from each other is quite interesting.

As Czarowich, Alexander III acquired a personal knowledge of the horrors of war, during the Bulgarian campaigns, and these sad experiences served to intensify the love of peace which he shares with his peaceful moujiks. Certainly, if there be war in Europe ere long, it will not be the fault of Alexander the Third.

But can even the hand of an Autocrat restrain the operation of this strange law of mutual destruction, that reigns throughout Nature, beginning in the vegetable Kingdom, and becoming more direful as it culminates in the highest sphere of its operations. In every great division of the Vegetable and Animal Kingdom, we find a class whose rôle seems to be the destruction of other creatures. We have beasts of prey, birds of prey, reptiles, insects and even plants of prey. Man, the arch destroyer of life, who kills for

every conceivable purpose, for food, for clothing, for ornament, for art and science, for amusement, and often from mere wantonness, seems charged to execute the portentous law against his fellow man. Men have slaughtered each other from time immemorial; and the more sacred the cause, the more advanced the nation, the more deadly has been the carnage.

It is customary to judge most superficially of European Wars and to attribute them, without any further reflection, to the petty passions of despotic Kings and Priests. But has human blood ceased to flow where the power of these factors is no longer exercised? Can we even hope that in the "Confederation of Nations," international arbitration will stem the gory tide, and stay the fratricidal effusion of blood, when we have seen the most deadly intercline warfare rage, for years, in a country endowed with an admirable Constitution, and free Republican institutions?

Perhaps the extermination of savage tribes in Africa may, for some time to come, satisfy the exigencies of this dire law, and ensure a prolonged peace to civilized nations.—But it is greatly to be feared, that the scramble for foothold on the Dark Continent will, on the contrary, be only another *casus belli*, and give rise to a new series of wars to maintain "the balance of power" in Africa.

Si vis pacem para bellum, and the Czar has, for this very reason, not neglected to fortify his frontiers and place his fleet on a par with the foremost, while the Russian army is, undoubtedly, the largest and the best equipped in Europe.

This peace loving Czar has, by infinite tact and forbearance, brought about what the sword was unable to accomplish; for the Balkan Peninsula, including Greece and Montenegro, are practically Russianized, and the House of Romanoff reigns, already, in the hearts of these various peoples. Against such sovereignty, diplomacy, and the sword are alike unavailing.

If, "Peace hath her victories not less renowned than war," it may be, that to Alexander the Third is reserved the glory of replacing the Cross on the dome of Saint Sophia, where the Credo and the Te Deum were sung in union by the Greek and Latin Churches, for the last time, in 1436. And, whatever may be our lines of religious demarkation, it would surely be a joy, transcending all petty sectarian differences, to see, again, on this Venerable Basilica, the Sign of the Redemption, that Constantine the Great exalted on all the public monuments of Constantinople, fifteen centuries ago.

CHAPTER XVI.

CONCLUSION.

Notwithstanding the complacency of the Powers, who conferred at Berlin in 1879, the Eastern question was far from solved. It was only complicated and postponed.

Contrary to all precedent, the prime minister, Lord Beaconsfield, insisted on representing England himself, at this conference. So anxious was he to assure to the Porte every shred of territory and authority, by which it was still possible to bolster up the crumbling institution on the Bosphorous, whose days were evidently numbered. The man who had been hooted in the House of Commons, when he made his maiden speech, "in a bottle green frock coat, and waistcoat of white, of the Dick Swiveller pattern, the front of which exhibited a net work of glittering chains; large fancy pattern pantaloons; clustering ringlets of coal black hair that fell in bunches of well oiled ringlets over his left cheek"—Benjamin Disraeli, now in the zenith of his political career, found, moreover, on this occasion, an irresistible opportunity for indulging his Oriental love of theatrical display. He surrounded his journey to the Continent, with all the pomp of a royal progress, and postured during the Congress, as if he were the arbiter of the destinies of Europe.

The alleged object of this Congress had been to

ameliorate the condition of the Balkan Christians, and provide for their future welfare.

But, underlying the averred object, was a determined intention on the part of at least one of the Powers, England, to maintain the Ottoman Empire, at all costs, and no matter what the consequences to the peoples for whom Russia had waged war in 1877. Since fourteen years Austria continues to occupy Bosnia and Herzegovina, militarily, to the dissatisfaction of all parties. The Moslems naturally resent the presence and interference of foreign "Christian dogs: " Roman Catholic Slavs are discontented at having Magyar Bishops instead of Slavs; while Greek Catholics, who compose the bulk of the population, are sullen, and distrustful of Austria, whom they fear and dislike.

On 27 May, 1893, the Emperor, Franz Joseph "congratulated the Austrian and Hungarian delegations on the fact that the expenses of the administration and military occupancy of Bosnia and Herzegovina were covered by the revenue of these provinces."—New York Herald.

It was alleged at the Conference, that the measure was requisite for the maintenance of peace in Europe, with which it absolutely has no connection. Later on, Lord Beaconsfield himself, openly acknowledged that the arrangement had been made, in order that another Power, not Russia, should be on the high road to Constantinople, in case the long expected demise of the "Sick Man" should occur, unexpectedly. The motive was puerile, but most unfortunate in its results for these provinces, whose resources are taxed

to the utmost, to support a foreign army of occupation.

The most unwarrantable partition of Bulgaria was another point on which Lord Beaconsfield succeeded in defeating what should have been the object of the Berlin Conference. It is needless to say, that this measure, too, was a kind of prophylactic against future contingent aggression, on the part of Russia; though it is not easy to see how it was to operate.

The Conference of Paris, in 1856 had, on the same principle, endeavored to provide against the union of the Danubian Principalities, and signally failed. Moldavia and Wallachia became united under an hereditary Prince of the House of Hohenzollern. Roumania, as the new State was called, joined Russia in the Bulgarian war, and obtained the full recognition of her independence by the Porte and by the Powers, who conferred at Berlin in 1879. Slav influence is predominant in the governing assemblies of this thriving little frontier State. And, should the Russians wish to invade the Sultan's dominions to-morrow, the right of way through the Dobrudja would, no doubt, be accorded to them, as freely as in 1877, the very contingency against which the Powers were so anxious to provide.

Eastern Roumelia, a portion of Bulgaria, handed back to Turkey, succeeded by a series of revolts against Moslem misrule, in acquiring a certain independence, and is now in a sort of anomalous condition, waiting for Russia to complete the work she initiated by the Bulgarian War.

Austrian influence in Servia has entirely ceased.

Prince Milan prudently abdicated in favor of his son Alexander, who is to all intents and purposes a ward of Russia; his mother Queen Nathalie, being a Russian and a devoted Panslavist. Ristitch, the minister during the minority of King Milan expressed the sentiments of his countrymen and indeed of all the Balkan Slavs, when he said: "We can never forget what "Russia has done for us. It is to her we owe our existence. It was Russia who in 1812, 1815, 1821, "1830, intervened in our behalf. It is useless to recall her services in the last war, (1877.) It is from "Russia, that we expect the deliverance of all the Slav "populations."

The Croatians too, resent being treated like a Hungarian dependancy, and look forward to the time when, "a few million Magyars will be swallowed up in the "Slav ocean, that will overwhelm them."

Montenegro, the brave little State that resisted Moslem domination, with more or less success, for five centuries, enjoys complete independence since 1879, and is devoted to the House of Romanoff, is one of the family in fact.

Justin McCarthy, correctly diagnosed the situation in the Balkan Peninsula when he said, that "to the "Slav populations the neighborhood of Russia has all "the disturbing effect, which the propinquity of a "magnet might have on the works of some delicate "piece of mechanism, or which the neighborhood "of one great planet has on the movements of "another."

And it is about as useless to seek to undermine and destroy Russian influence, nay Russian preponderance,

in the Balkans, as to demagnetize the pole, or change the immutable laws of gravitation.

Nevertheless great efforts have been made in this direction.

It was in Bulgaria chiefly that German diplomacy, steered by Bismarck, was the most strenuous in its efforts to supplant Russia. After the Bulgarian War and the Conference of Berlin, there was at Constantinople a veritable invasion of the Teutons. In the course of a single year, it is said that two hundred million piasters of German products were imported. Many German officers commanded in the Sultan's army, and patriotically enabled the Fatherland to get rid of her cast off guns and amunition, by foisting them on the Turks. Other Germans filled high offices in the State; and they were all fortunate enough to receive their salaries, rather an unusual thing among Turkish employees.

Strong influences were brought to bear on the Bulgarians, who were, for a time, persuaded that their worst enemies were the Russians, to whom they owed their existence, as an independent State.

But the irresistible attraction exercised by Russia is reasserting itself in Bulgaria. The tenure of Prince Bismarck's creature, Ferdinand of Coburg, is very precarious. No ovations tendered to him in foreign States, or in Bulgaria; no private loans made to him by his father-in-law, or by Baron Hirsch, can confirm his throne, nor induce Russia to countenance his incumbency. His presence in Bulgaria is a direct violation of the Treaty of Berlin, which requires that the Prince of Bulgaria be unanimously elected by all the signatory powers.

Ferdinand of Coburg is in Sophia, merely on sufferance, and until some other arrangement can be made. Unless he succeed in propitiating Russia, and obtaining her approval, he is bound, sooner or later, to go the way of Alexander of Battenberg, and Milan of Servia. The good he is said to have accomplished must be attributed to some stronger personality than his own. In spite of all the good advice he received from de Burien, Austria's representative at Sophia, he had not even sense enough to avoid the impolicy of rousing the antagonism of the Greek National Church of Bulgaria; and it is doubtful, if he can ever be anything but a man of straw.

The Triple Alliance, whose mandatary he is, has, itself, but a precarious existence, quite as much so, indeed, as the superannuated, rotten institution on the Bosphorus, which the Allied Powers are pledged to maintain.

This "Dribund" is composed of elements so incongruous and antithetic, that it must end in dissolution. There can be little sympathy between Protestant Germany and Catholic Italy, whose natural ally would be France, to whom she owes her political unity. Austria cannot so soon have forgotten Sadova, while the Irridentists of Italy openly claim the Italian Provinces incorporated with Austria. Moreover Austria's sympathies are entirely with the dethroned Pope. How then can she consistently band herself with the Government that has overthrown him; and how long can the *entente cordiale* be maintained in this "Happy Family," where so many elements of discord are rife?

Even if the pressure of circumstances should, for a time, hold together the nations who compose the Triple Alliance, the ethnical attraction, which is drawing together the peoples of the same race, will assert itself some day. When this day arrives, the political mosaïque, known as the Austrian Empire, will be the first, to feel the effects of the working of these latent forces, and resolve itself into its pristine proportions. The Slav peoples, who compose the greater part of this heterogeneous empire, and of the Balkan Peninsula, will gravitate towards Russia; those of Teutonic origin towards Germany. And the Latin provinces, wrested from Italy, will probably return to the mother country.

That the actual *modus vivendi* in the Balkans is a precarious one, is generally, felt, though not openly acknowledged.

The present Sultan, Abdul Hamid, is only a *locus tenens* of his brother Mourad, who, on account of partial insanity was pronounced incapable of reigning by a "Fetwa" of the Sheik-ul-Islam. The same symptoms are manifesting themselves in Abdul Hamid, and State and religious functionaries are already discussing the advisability of removing him from the throne. A civil war in Turkey, is one of the many contingencies, which may precipitate the dissolution of this five hundred year old monstrosity.

Nor are theories for disposing of the future of Turkey in Europe wanting. The most plausible of them, seems to be the scheme of constituting a Federation somewhat like that of the Swiss Cantons, and in which Constantinople, would be neutralized and trans-

formed into a Free Port, under the conjoint tutelage of all the Powers.

If this plan were carried out, the Powers would probably find rocking a cradle, quite as onerous as watching by the "Sick Man's" death bed.

The Swiss Cantons enjoy immunity from political interference, on the part of European nations, for many reasons, which do not exist in the Balkan Peninsula. Constantinople, itself, would always be a tempting *en jeu* for ambitious rulers; for, by her position, this city commands the commerce of both continents, and the European nation who held it, would be, practically, mistress in Europe and in Asia. This is one of the reasons, why the Turkish nonentity has been so zealously maintained and defended against Russia, whose chances of gaining the prize are many.

Russopholists, imbued with the traditional cant about Russian greed, and the urgent need of saving the world from Muscovite despotism, have often smiled at the naïveté of those who believed in the disinterestedness of Russia's services on behalf of the Balkan Christians, whereas, the Northern Bear was only seeking to devour new prey. Formerly such accusations might have had some weight. But, as Mr. Gladstone once remarked: "The public can no longer be scared by the standing hobgoblin of Russia. Many a time has it done good service on the stage; it is at present out of repair and unavailable."

There is, indeed, something ludicrous in the panicky fear that Russia arouses among the English, and in the Quixotic measures taken, from time to time, to stave off the inevitable. The disastrous Afghan wars,

as well as the Crimean and the Persian wars were inspired by this dread, which increased with every step of Russian advance in Central Asia.

In 1878, on one memorable night, when there was a rumor that the Russians were actually in the suburbs of Constantinople, "the House of Commons," says Justin McCarthy, "nearly lost its head. The lobbies, "the corridors, St. Stephen's Hall, the great Westminster Hall itself, the Palace Yard beyond, became "filled with wildly excited and tumultuous crowds," p. 604, Vol. II, "A history of our own times." The English fleet immediately anchored below Constantinople, and then followed a little scene worthy of school boys on a play-ground. "You promised to keep your hands "off," protested Russia. "And you promised not to "enter Constantinople," cried England. "Nor have I "done so," calmly retorted Russia, "but I will if you "advance another step." "I will stay where I am," said England, "but will not land, if you will promise "again not to pass the gates of Constantinople." And thereupon *pourparlers* and secret understandings began, that resulted in the Congress of Berlin.

To-day Russia is, as regards territory, much in the position of a Cræsus, to whom a million, more or less, must be so indifferent, that he can hardly be accused of struggling and dissimulating in order to secure it. Indeed, for many years to come, additional territory can mean nothing but added burden and expense to Russia; so that, if she should make any new conquests, it certainly would be done only under the pressure of necessity.

I am well aware that some Russian writers depre-

ciate the value of Constantinople, and repudiate all covetous feelings on the subject. Nevertheless, the Russians are certainly heirs at law of the Greek Emperors, from whom Constantinople was wrested by the Turks in 1453; and the "Holy City," on the Bosphorus, must be, to all members of the Greek Church, what Rome is to Roman Catholics, all over the world. It is their religious metropolis.

Moreover, there is a law of national, as well as physical organisms, that compels them to seek, necessarily, their natural good, self-preservation and development. Now a free way to the ocean, at all seasons of the year, is as necessary to Russia's growth and expansion as an adequate supply of oxygen is to a powerful and growing organism. She must have it or stifle. Russia cannot, therefore, forego Constantinople; it is for her an imperious necessity that she have free access to the Mediterranean; and to secure this, the key of her house must be in her power, if not in her actual possession. She might not object to a vassal door-keeper; indeed, I think she would prefer one. But a turnkey, she certainly will not tolerate, if she can possibly help it, nor could any one expect her to do so.

But Constantinople, all important though it be, is not the kernel of the Eastern Question. Russia could, *à la rigueur*, find her way to the Mediterranean by way of Asia Minor.

One of the tendencies of civilization is to render men gregarious. It was thus that our far away ancestors formed themselves into groups and societies, that developed into nations. Several of these nations,

kindred by origin, creed and language, have, in the course of time, been arbitrarily segregated by conquerors and statesmen, who have parcelled them out among different rulers, according to certain laws of expediency, and, wholly irrespective of natural affinities. But an irresistible movement is drawing together, again, these disjointed parts, and has been the underlying cause of recent wars in Europe, vulgarly ascribed to the susceptibilities and ambitions of those in power.

German unity was preluded by the annexation of Holstein, wrested from Denmark ; the Italian wars of 1859, the war between Germany and Austria in 1866, the Franco German war of 1870, were the unconscious elaboration of this attractive force, and the reconstitution of Europe according to the ethnical principle. It is the fermentation of this leaven, complicated by Moslem misrule, that, properly speaking, constitutes the Eastern Question.

The unnatural distribution of Europe effected by the bloody wars of Louis XIV, and the First Napoleon, will probably be swept away some day in a still more sanguinary conflict. In their new baptism of blood, the masses will awake to a better life ; and, in the knowledge of their long unrecognized royalty, become, for the first time, the arbiters of their own destinies.

We are advancing towards a time, when the "confederation of nations, and the Parliament of man," will no longer be a poet's dream, but accomplished facts. North America has already furnished a prototype of the Confederation of Sovereign States, harmoniously welded together under a common chief. And

if such confederations are to exist on a larger scale, we should, of course, expect that the great branches of the human race, would each constitute a separate confederation under the hegemony of the principal group.

In this case, nothing would be more natural, than that there should be a great Slav Confederation, of which the Czar of all the Russias would be the center ; and a great Teutonic Confederation, to which all the scattered families of the Fatherland would gravitate.

England, herself, would be the greatest gainer by such a movement. Instead of undergoing periodical dismemberments, which would leave her, finally, an object of venerable pity, in the insular isolation of her waning years, she would rally around her flag the great young nations, who stole her fire, and became strong and prosperous, at a bound, so to speak, because they were backed by centuries of training ; and had, moreover, inherited a noble strain, that has always produced great men, in every walk of life.

As to the actual masters of Constantinople, and the fair lands of Turkey in Europe, which they desolate, enough has been said to convince an impartial mind that they have not the slightest claim to any civilized man's sympathy. Their right to the soil is one of conquest, it is true. But though a long established precedent has unjustly decided, that "might is right," even conquerors must, by conferring benefits, justify their "right," if it is to become imprescriptible. And this the Turks, unlike other conquerors, have never done.

It would be monotonous to multiply documents, and I will therefore restrict myself to a few statements

which will amply prove, that "the careful provision against future misgovernment," supposed to have been made by the Congress of Berlin—was an utter failure. And that "the opportunity, probably the last obtained for Turkey, by the interposition of the Powers, of England in particular," *was* completely "thrown away."

In 1880 Sir Henry Layard, an earnest Turcophil, admitted that "he had exhausted every diplomatic resource to bring the Sultan to a sense of the danger, to which the empire is exposed." For, to minds like his, Turkish misrule has no significance, except when considered subjectively; what the unfortunate victims of this misrule suffer is quite a secondary consideration, if indeed it be at all worth considering.

Lord Granville, in the same year, wrote thus to Mr. Gochen, during the latter's official residence in Constantinople—"your excellency will do well to make the Sultan understand, that the only hope of maintaining the Ottoman Empire rests upon a complete and radical reform, both in the capital and in the provinces."

Five years later Mr. Lavelye wrote: "No reforms have been effected. The situation has become in all ways much worse. The Porte ridicules the admonition and the threats of England and the other Powers, and nevertheless all the Powers agree in supporting this abominable rule, which is ruining the populations of every race and every faith." Mr. Lavelye is by no means a Russophil, and his testimony is in every respect reliable.

Not less reliable is the testimony of Robert Mac-

kenzie. I quote the following passage from his historical work, "The Nineteenth Century," p. 399.

"If the social condition of the Turks could be fully explained, the English people would shudder at the thought of maintaining a horde of savages, so utterly debased. But that is impossible. It was truly said by Cobden; that we must remain ignorant of the social condition of Turkey, because it is indescribable."

"Where ignorance is bliss, 'tis folly to be wise."

And as it suited "British interests" to maintain the Turks, they have persistently ignored and palliated the utter corruption and crimes of a government, of whom they are the self-constituted sponsors, by the Anglo-Turkish Convention and by the Treaty of Berlin, 1879.

Hall Cain's "Scape Goat," presents a truthful picture of Turkish misrule everywhere. The system of farming out taxes in Morocco which he describes, is a common practice in the Turkish Empire. Not the office of tax collector only, but of judges and magistrates; and in fact every official position is obtained by purchase, and retained by bribery. Slavery is still a recognized institution; and quite a lucrative traffic, carried on chiefly by women of rank.

Not only have the Turks paralyzed, in the march of progress, the nations on whom they have preyed for centuries, but these Moslems have not even, in themselves, any elements of evolution. The encomiums lavished on them by Turcophils are, no doubt, justified in individual cases; but, as a nation, they are essentially non-progressive. Their limitations were many,

and they were quickly reached. Since the fifteenth century, there has been, no development, no progress among them. And there can be none—for the Koran fixes their civil and criminal laws.

A hard and fast legislation, adapted to the status and welfare of nomadic bandits, who roved around the plains and plateaus of Asia, twelve centuries ago, sacking and pillaging, and appropriating, cannot possibly be that of a civilized and progressive State.

For education the Turks care nothing, as a rule. The only book the men are taught to read is the Koran. The women, with few exceptions, are wholly illiterate. Why indeed should anything be taught to a creature supposed to have no soul ?

Financially speaking, Turkey is bankrupt, and her revenues are mortgaged to the fullest extent ; only one step is needed to precipitate the dissolution of a body in the last stage of decay. This would be the secularization of the Vakoufs, or ecclesiastical estates and religious foundations, as was done in France, by the Revolution of 1793. It would be the extinguishing of the last spark of religious enthusiasm, the generating and vivifying principle of the Turkish Empire. The dangerous experiment of appropriating ecclesiastical property, has been tried to some extent, but it was not successful, even from a financial point of view ; for little of the money reached the Sultan's coffers, having been diverted into the pockets of State functionaries.

As regards agricultural industry, which is the principal resource of the country, it will die out completely, if the present administration lasts much longer.

“The ground lies waste at the very gates of the capital, and solitude spreads in the most beautiful regions of the Empire, on the shores of the Sea of Marmora and the *Ægean*. The country through which we passed, writes de Blowitz, was a desert of immense plains, grassy and fertile, but uncultivated. The deserted villages, on all sides, indicated former prosperity, but the inhabitants had fled, and brambles grew over all. Half a century ago, many of these villages were still inhabited, others have been long deserted.”

Not only do the Balkan regions enjoy the most delightful climate in Europe, but they are rich in mineral resources. Gold, quicksilver, iron, coal, salt and copper abound, in easily accessible localities; while a long stretch of sea-coast affords singular facilities for commerce. Recently, the opening of the Corinth Canal has added to these facilities, by making closer communication, between the Mediterranean and the *Ægean* Sea. Trading vessels are no longer obliged to double Cape Matapan.

Many centuries ago, Venice and Genoa realized the great natural advantages, enjoyed by the Balkan Peninsula, and struggled to maintain their ascendancy in the *Ægean* and the Bosphorus, against all commercial rivals. They carried on a lucrative commerce with Asia, until both were dispossessed, by the savage conquerors of the Western Cæsars, the Ottoman Turks, in the fifteenth century.

The Malthusian theory is quite at fault in the Balkan Peninsula. For in spite of the exuberant fertility of the soil, the population is only about one-third of

what it used to be in the time of the Romans, before the fall of Constantinople.

During the present century alone, more than forty villages are said to have become extinct in Turkey.

But the desolation that is rapidly gaining ground, in Turkey, is not the greatest nor the only evil. There is a more serious one, which may well be deprecated, even by remote countries, in these days of facile inter-communication.

Constantinople is becoming more than ever a plague center, whence pestilential germs are constantly being exported and disseminated throughout the world.

The only practical result of the Emperor William's visit to the Sultan in 1889, was, that the streets of Constantinople, which "had been in a deplorably filthy condition for the previous ten years," received a thorough cleaning up. Sanitary reforms moreover are quite impossible under the present régime, where everything remains to be done, while inertia and corruption reign supreme.

Justin McCarthy, who is so frank and impartial a writer, in spite of Russophobic tendencies, alleges the difficulty of their task in extenuation of the notorious misgovernment of the Ottoman Turks.

"It is not less Turkey's misfortune," he says, "than her fault—certainly not less her fault than her mis-

It is quite amusing to read in the New York Herald, October, 1893, that Turkey has quarantined against the United States; that no vessel will be admitted to Ottoman Ports without a clean bill of health, which must be signed by the Turkish Consul, of New York. They are perhaps beginning to realize that they have no use for imported germs, of any kind, as they cultivate enough to supply not only the Russian Empire, but the whole world with comma bacilli.

“fortune—that her way of governing her foreign provinces, (meaning Turkey in Europe, the major part of the Ottoman Empire.) Fate, (represented by England since 1696,) has given to the most incapable and worthless government in the world, a task that would strain the resources of the most accomplished statesmanship.”

“The Turkish Government managed the matter worse than it might seem possible for a government to do, which had been brought for centuries, within the action of European civilization. Turkish rule seems to exist only in one of two extremes. In certain places, it means entire relaxation of authority; in others, it means the most rude and rigorous oppression. The warlike inhabitants of some highland region, live their wild and lawless lives, with as much indifference to the officials of Stamboul, as to the remonstrances of Western statesmanship. But it may be, that not far from their frontier line, there is some hapless province, whose people feel the hand of Turkey, strong and cruel, at every moment of their lives. It happens, as is not unnatural in such a system, that the repression is heaviest where it is least needed, and that in the only cases where severity and rigor might be exercised, there is an entire relaxation of all central authority. P. 586, vol. II. A history of our own times.”

All this is rigorously true. The Ottoman Government has abundantly proved, since five centuries, that it is utterly unworthy and incapable of filling the position it occupies. Yet, in 1856, England made a desperate effort to re-organize and admit the Turks into

the political fellowship of European States, a privilege from which they had hitherto, been debarred, by common consent—and for good reasons. Yet, during the thirty-five years that have elapsed since the Crimean War, the Porte has given no signs that it is more fitted to govern. On the contrary, the most sanguine of its supporters begin to despair of its future.

Between 1756 and 1857, England has deposed Musulman Princes in India, one after another, and annexed their territory, on the ground that they were incapable, or unworthy to govern, even peoples of their own race and creed. Why should Russia's hand have been stayed whenever she has attempted to carry out the same policy, in a country adjoining her Empire? She could, at least, allege that the peoples so oppressed were her kindred, by origin and creed; whereas England had no such pretext in India.

So much for the carrying out in European Turkey of the programme of reform, devised by the Berlin Conference.

But "the careful provision against future misgovernment," made by the Signatory Powers at Berlin in 1879, did not regard Turkey in Europe only. Lord Salisbury, alluding to the Anglo Turco Convention, also informed the Powers, that "arrangements of a different kind, having the same end in view, had provided for the Asiatic dominions of the Sultan, security for the present, and hope of prosperity and stability for the future." If he meant "security and prosperity," for the unfortunate Christians in the East, certainly these arrangements were most unsatisfactory, as far as Armenia was concerned.

In June, 1889, Lord Carnarvon informed the House of Lords, that "a million of Christian people were "being ground down by misery and oppression in "Armenia. Men were put to death in the most barbarous manner; women carried off or subjected to "the most horrible cruelties." (New York Herald, June 30th, 1889.)

And these miserable Turks, for whom the Treaty of Berlin and the Anglo Turko Convention, were no more sacred than the treaties of Kainardji, or of Adrianople, looked on complacently at the atrocities committed by Moussa Bey and his savage Kurds, utterly unmindful of their solemn engagements, to protect these Christian subjects from the outrages to which they were subjected.

Like Pilate of old, Lord Salisbury washed his hands from any responsibility, and refused to admit that England had made herself in any way answerable for the maintenance of order in Turkish dominions. Yet she most certainly did so, conjointly with the other Powers at Berlin, (Section 6) and more especially so by the Anglo Turko Convention. If she does not see fit to call her protégés to account, Russia may once again, as in 1877, relieve her in the discharge of this duty.

Nor was it in Armenia alone that the "provisions" made by the Berlin conference, totally belied the expectations of Christendom. In July, 1889, the Sultan sent re-inforcements of troops to quell the insurrections that were expected to break out in the island of Crete, among the oppressed Greek Christians. The Triple Alliance having undertaken the maintenance

of the Turkish Empire as the basis of their programme, "carefully considered" the condition of these unfortunate Greek Christians.

The allied powers demanded from the Sultan that the Island should have a Christian governor, and a mixed council, half Moslem and half Christian, according to the Treaty of Berlin. The Porte responded by sending another Moslem governor, with a well established reputation for religious fanaticism.

In a word, the same nugatory negotiations were gone through between the European Powers and the Porte as in 1876, the former demanding guarantees against future misgovernment and oppression, the latter promising full satisfaction, and always evading the fulfillment of any of its engagements.

Massacres in Crete in 1866 preluded the great atrocities that led to the Bulgarian war in 1876. And it may be that what is being perpetrated in Armenia is only the signal for some new developments in the blood-stained career of the Osmanlis Turks. "We may ransack the annals of the world," says Gladstone, "but I know not what research can furnish us with so portentous an example of the fiendish misuse of the Powers established by God for the punishment of evil-doers, and to reward them that do well. No government has ever so sinned, none has so proved itself incorrigible in sin, or which is the same thing, so impotent for reformation."

When during one of Russia's most successful campaigns, (1774,) some one suggested to the Turks that it might well happen that the tide of war landed them at Scutari, on the other side of the Bosphorus. "What's

the odds," was the reply, "we can smoke our pipes there as well as here." This rejoinder is characteristic of the Osmanlis Turks. Sloth, selfishness, absence of all chivalry, patriotism and justice. Such are the flowers and fruits of this upas tree, under whose baneful shadow the fairest lands of Europe languish since nearly five centuries. When will all the nations of the world concur in saying "Cut it down, why cumbereth it the ground?"

Overwhelmed by their own pre-occupations and the struggle to live, civilized nations have somewhat lost sight of the sad condition of fellow Christians, groaning under Turkish misrule. A wailing echo reaches us from time to time, as recently, in April, 1893, and again in August, 1893, when Armenians residing in New York "adopted resolutions against the oppression of their countrymen in Armenia by the Turks, "and asking civilized communities to aid them in relieving their native land. They appeal to the signatory powers of the Berlin treaty for protection, "and state that the reforms vouchsafed by the various "existing treaties affecting their country have never "been secured. They also ask the British government to lose no time in the specific enforcement of "her treaty stipulations with Turkey." (New York Herald, 22d August, 1893.)

The total and most notorious non-observance, by the Porte of the stipulations of the Treaty of Berlin, is another *casus belli*, of which Russia may at any moment avail herself, whether the other signatory powers choose to join her or not, in the invasion of Ottoman Territory, to coerce the Turks into due performance of their obligations.

As in the past, the momentary indignation roused by new acts of Moslem brutality, is quickly appeased by perfidious protestations and nugatory concessions. Christian peoples lay to their souls the flattering unction contained in Lord Salisbury's suave words, "careful provision has been made against future misgovernment."

And so time glides by, till the inevitable day, when the inexorable Eastern Question will burst upon us again like a thunder clap.

NEW YORK, APRIL, 1889.

AIKEN, S. C., NOVEMBER, 1893.

U. C. BERKELEY LIBRARIES



C047126550

